

# The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES    VOL. XLI    NO. 2    FEBRUARY 1956

## THE NEW ORDER OF HOLY WEEK—I

THE new Order of Holy Week aims at restoring a simpler, more austere rite for the greatest days of the liturgical year—a rite adapted to the conditions of modern life—by the removal of undesirable excrescences of gradual growth over the centuries, and the revival of important features that had been lost, or at least overshadowed, in the course of time.

This restoration is based on modern knowledge of the growth and development of the sacred rites from their first beginnings in the early centuries of Christianity, and on sound principles of liturgical reform. Its chief aim is to recreate a *living* liturgy for the entire congregation taking in it its due active part.

The new Order for each day of the Week has its special theme: for Palm Sunday the exaltation of the Messianic function of Christ; for Maundy Thursday the love of our Lord in the institution of the Blessed Eucharist and His fraternal charity in the washing of feet; for Good Friday, the Sacred Passion; for Holy Saturday, our Lord's sojourn in the tomb; for Easter Eve and Easter Day the power and glory of Christ's resurrection.

### PALM SUNDAY

The day is now called *Dominica II Passionis seu in Palmis* (its old name was *De Passione Domini*) to emphasize that it is not the blessing of palms that is its chief feature.

The new rite is remarkable for the simplification of the blessing of palms—a rite of later origin and quite subsidiary—and its emphasis on the procession, with its acclamations of Christ as the Messiah. All through it makes provision for the simpler rite when there is no deacon and subdeacon to take part.

### THE BLESSING OF PALMS

The colour for the first part of the ceremony is now red (which was formerly the colour) and the Asperges is omitted.

The palms may be held by the people, or they may be put on a table in the sanctuary so placed, however, that it can be seen by the congregation. The blessing is carried out facing the people. Its rite has been greatly simplified and abbreviated. After the opening antiphon *Hosanna*, instead of a prayer, lesson, Gradual, Gospel, prayer, preface and Sanctus, and six prayers of blessing, there is only one prayer (*Benedic*), the fifth of the previous series. The celebrant next sprinkles and incenses the palms at the table, and then—if the people have their palms—at the altar rail, or going around the church. The palms are then distributed in the customary way, to the clergy<sup>1</sup> and assistants, and to the people (unless they already have their palms). Meantime, instead of the singing of the two antiphons (*Pueri Hebraeorum*) alone, the first antiphon is repeated after each two verses of Psalm xxiii (verses 1-2, 7-10, in the new version), and the second antiphon after each two verses of Psalm xlvii—psalms that sing the praise of the Messianic King. Should the distribution finish quickly the psalm is terminated by *Gloria Patri* and the repetition of the antiphon; should it continue for a long time the psalms and antiphons are repeated. The celebrant washes his hands, and then comes the singing of the Gospel, Matthew xxi, 1-9, by the deacon (the gospel that preceded the prayers of blessing in the old rite) as at high Mass. The celebrant, having kissed the altar, puts incense into the censer, blesses the deacon, etc., as usual. At the conclusion of the Gospel the subdeacon takes the book to be kissed by the celebrant, but the latter is not incensed.

#### THE PROCESSION WITH BLESSED PALMS

The procession is as in the old rite, except that: (a) the processional cross is unveiled; (b) the people (carrying their palms) are to walk in the procession, following the celebrant; (c) the procession is (if possible) to go outside the church and proceed by "some longer way", or (recalling the early practice), if there is another church at which the palms can be conveniently blessed, the procession may then go from there to the principal church. All this, of course, is to emphasize that the procession

<sup>1</sup> No mention is made of the celebrant receiving a palm.

## THE NEW ORDER OF HOLY WEEK 67

is the important thing in the first part of the ceremony, and not the blessing of the palms, which is of more recent Gallican origin. Of the six antiphons previously sung during the procession, numbers four (slightly changed), five and six are retained, and there is a new (fourth) antiphon, Luke xix, 37-8, welcoming and praising the Messianic King. During the procession—and no longer before the church door—is sung the famous ninth-century *Gloria laus*, called in the new rite “Hymn to Christ-King”, everyone repeating the first two verses as a refrain. The knocking at the door of the church with the processional cross—a dramatic detail of the twelfth century, which did not gain entrance into the Roman Missal until the edition of Clement VIII in 1604—has been abolished. Following *Gloria laus* come three new antiphons—the first of them enfaming Psalm cxlvii in the revised text—all including the words “Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini”, giving them a Messianic character. A rubric adds that it is permissible for the people to sing any hymn in honour of Christ-King. The final antiphon, the eighth, begun as the celebrant passes through the church door, is *Ingrediente Domino*, as in the former rite. Having arrived at the altar and made due reverence to it, the celebrant goes up to the footpace and there, facing the people, sings *Dominus vobiscum* and the prayer (a new one, addressed to the Second Person) that terminates the first part of the day's liturgy.

In this new rite the provision for the active participation of the people in the ceremony is noteworthy: (a) the palms are to be blessed in sight of the congregation and facing them (§§4, 5); (b) all are to answer *Et cum spiritu tuo* (§§6, 22), and *In nomine Christi, Amen.* (§16), (c) the people are to take part in the procession (§16) and women are not excluded; (d) they are to sing, if they can, the refrain *Gloria laus* (§19) and may add a hymn in honour of Christ-King of their own (§20); (e) the prayer that closes the procession is to be sung facing the congregation (§22).

### THE MASS OF PALM SUNDAY

The colour is violet and the deacon and subdeacon wear dalmatic and tunic instead of folded chasubles. At the Mass at which the blessing and procession of palms takes place, the

psalm *Judica* and the Confession are omitted. On arrival the celebrant kisses the altar and at once incenses it. The Introit is called *Antiphona ad introitum*. The text of the Mass (with the exception of the Passion) remains as hitherto, but the celebrant does not repeat anything that the deacon, subdeacon or lector sings or reads as part of his particular function (in accordance with II, §6, of the Instruction of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, accompanying the decree *Maxima*). There are some changes in the rite of the chanting of the Passion: (a) unveiled legilia are prepared for the books;<sup>1</sup> (b) the three deacons who sing the Passion, kneeling before the altar on the lowest step, deeply bowed, say in a low tone *Munda cor meum* and ask the celebrant's blessing (this he gives with the same form as for the Gospel at high Mass, but in the plural); (c) the account of the Passion given by St. Matthew (chapters xxvi, xxvii) has been abbreviated, it now begins at verse 36, omitting the account of the Last Supper and beginning at the entry into the garden of Gethsemani, and ends at verse 54 of chapter xxvii (instead of verse 66), and the last part is no longer sung as a Gospel;<sup>2</sup> (d) the palms are not held during the chanting of the Passion; (e) at its conclusion the celebrant no longer kisses the book and is not incensed.<sup>3</sup>

The Offertory is now termed *Antiphona ad offertorium* and the Communion *Antiphona ad communionem*. The blessing ends the Mass, there is no last Gospel.

As in the old rite, at Masses other than that at which the liturgy of the day takes place, the Gospel from the blessing of the palms (Matthew xxi, 1-9) is read as the last Gospel.

#### MONDAY, TUESDAY, WEDNESDAY OF HOLY WEEK

The deacon and subdeacon wear dalmatic and tunicle instead of folded chasubles; the rite of the chanting of the

<sup>1</sup> The Ceremonial of Bishops (II, xxi, 15) supposes only one book used, and this to be held by one of the servers accompanying the deacons who sing the Passion.

<sup>2</sup> The Passion narrative is called in the rite "Evangelium passionis et mortis Domini".

<sup>3</sup> The priest who celebrates a second or third Mass on Palm Sunday is not obliged to repeat the Passion. Instead he sings or recites verses 45-52 of the XXVIIth chapter of S. Matthew as a Gospel.



Passion is as on Palm Sunday. The Passion according to St. Mark on Tuesday has been abbreviated by the omission of verses 1-31 of chapter xiv; while St. Luke's account has been shortened by the omission of verses 1-38 of chapter xxii. A rubric on Wednesdays preceding the first prayer, orders a short prayer to be said kneeling after *Flectamus genua*, before the deacon (not the subdeacon as hitherto) sings *Levate*, or the celebrant in low Mass gives this direction.

J. B. O'CONNELL

---

### RELATIONSHIPS IN THE FAMILY COMMUNITY<sup>1</sup>

IN his encyclical on Christian marriage Pope Pius XI used an interesting and striking analogy to describe the place of husband and wife in the family. After quoting Saint Paul who, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, says that "the husband is the head of the wife, as Christ is the head of the Church", Pope Pius went on: "If the man is the head, the woman is the heart, and as he occupies the chief place in ruling, so she may and ought to claim for herself the chief place in love." Now one may look on this as a nice conceit, a rather romantic and picturesque way of describing the family: the man the head and the woman the heart. But it is much more than that. It expresses a profound sociological truth. It says that the family is at one and the same time a society and a community.

A society arises where there is a combination of people for a common end or purpose—and this means rules and regulations and a ruler. A society exists because of a *desire* for a common good. But a community exists because of the *fact* of a common element, and is based on people having things in common. In a society cohesion comes from the framework of law imposed on it in the name of the common good, whereas in a community cohesion and solidarity come from friendship, the primary

<sup>1</sup> The substance of a paper read at the annual conference of the Guild of Catholic Professional Social Workers held at Liverpool in May 1955.

product of sharing a common life. The family is a society, a natural society, and it has a common good which is the begetting and upbringing of children. The guardian of the common good, the head of the house, is the father. But it is a community too, and the source of love, the heart of the community, should be the mother. For a community must have a rallying point, an emotional core from which it draws its own special identity. This enables it to function as a unit, to do its job, to rise to specially challenging occasions—and to do all this while feeling good about itself. This core of integrity, this intangible feeling that “I am (or we are) somebody who counts, who can get on with the job of living and still have something left over, who can afford to feel some joy in it all” is something which just cannot be manufactured artificially. It wells up from a basic emotion, either from love or hate, for example. In the family community such a rallying point is the love of the wife for her husband and of the mother for her children.

When we speak of the importance of the family and of its defence it may be that we are thinking exclusively of it from the aspect of society without realizing that the community aspect needs strengthening too. In the modern world man has failed to find community. Whatever cohesion he has with his fellows comes more and more from laws imposed on him from without. In other words society (and often this means the power and authority of the State) grows while community declines, or is almost non-existent. The family is in eclipse as a community because it has suffered the ravages of individualism and because the Christian principles of family life have been neglected. Perhaps the greatest menace in our day is that which comes from the technological concept of life, and it was to this that the Holy Father called particular attention recently. “With particular anxiety,” he said, “we consider the danger threatening the family, which is the strongest principle of order in society. For the family is capable of inspiring in its members innumerable daily acts of service, binds them to the home and hearth with bonds of affection, and awakens in each of them a love of family traditions by working to preserve what is good and useful. On the contrary, wherever the technological concept of life penetrates the family loses its personal bond of unity and is

deprived of its warmth and stability. It remains united only in so far as mass production demands. . . . No longer is the family a work of love and a haven for souls; it is rather a desolate depot, according to circumstances, either of manpower for mass production, or of consumers of the material goods produced."<sup>1</sup>

This loss of community is something which is symptomatic of our whole industrial urban world. Modern industrial development and the modern city have not only broken up the old traditional communities but have made it almost impossible to redevelop them—and this fact is at the heart of today's social problem. In his Christmas message of 1952 the Holy Father pointed out that this is the problem to be solved if contemporary society is to survive. He said that "wherever the demon of organization invades and tyrannizes the human spirit, there are at once revealed the signs of a false and abnormal orientation of society. . . . Here may be recognized the origin and source of that phenomenon which is engulfing modern man under its tide of anguish: the despoiling him of his personality. In large measure his identity and name have been taken from him; in many of the more important activities of life he has been reduced to a chattel of society, while society itself has been transformed into an impersonal system".<sup>2</sup> A few months later Pope Pius referred to this again—evidently a matter which preoccupies him greatly: "Is it not perhaps too often forgotten that the basis of society, the very centre of education and of every culture, is the family? Does not the 'depersonalization' of social relations, which We lamented recently in Our Christmas message, arise particularly from this unawareness?"<sup>3</sup>

The family is a social unit which conforms to the essential nature of man, and in it he should be his own self and find his own nature as he can nowhere else. Time was when a man depended on his family for his recreation, his economic security, for his social security in time of stress, for help and support in time of distress. It gave him a sense of belonging. But how can it do this now when so many of man's activities, and important activities, are no longer governed by man himself, but by the

<sup>1</sup> *Catholic Documents*, xvi, p. 23.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, x, p. 29.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, xi, p. 25.

State or some other impersonal agency? The area of meaningful action, of meaningful being, even, has been considerably reduced and the urgent problem is to restore community within these limits, in other words to increase and deepen the fact and understanding of what is left in the family community so as to bear the weight of what was formerly spread over the whole of life. There are some signs that in time as the work done by Elton Mayo and his followers is more and more accepted and acted upon the importance of the small informal working group will play a larger part in industry, with a consequent restitution of community sense to factory work. But this is very much of a long-term hope.

In the meantime we are left with the family community, or more precisely with the human relationships inside the family community. In other words what is needed is a much greater self-consciousness and understanding of these relationships. There is nothing novel in this, because as Professor Titmuss has said: "Society is in process of making parenthood a highly self-conscious, self-regarding affair. In so doing, it is adding heavily to the sense of personal responsibility among parents. Their tasks are much harder and involve more risks of failure when children have to be brought up as individual successes in a supposedly mobile, individualistic society rather than in a traditional and repetitious society. Bringing up children becomes less a matter of rule-of-thumb custom and tradition; more a matter of acquired knowledge, of expert advice. More decisions have to be made because there is much more to be decided."<sup>1</sup> My plea is not for greater self-consciousness in the deliberate choices but, paradoxical though it may sound, more self-consciousness in the indeliberate and as it were unconscious elements of family life. And here I do no more than echo the words of Pope Pius XII: "It is essential that adult education should not lose sight of the importance of preparing young people for matrimony and for the serious obligations of fathers and mothers of families. . . . Mothers must acquire the elementary knowledge necessary for the government of a family, the art of keeping a house in order, of dealing with statements of

<sup>1</sup> *The Family*, Report of the British National Conference on Social Work, 1953, p. 9.

accounts, useful ideas about bringing up children, and, above all, enough understanding of the rules of pedagogy, to profit by the experience of others, without placing too much confidence in their mother instinct which, of itself, will not always and surely keep them from harmful mistakes."<sup>1</sup>

In what follows my object is to consider the family community as made up of father, mother and children, boys and girls. It is not about an average family derived from the consideration of innumerable case histories, but rather about the basic social facts that flow, or should flow, from the very nature of the different members of the family and the community nexus between them. I am well aware that to speak of certain social forms being natural—or more natural than others—does not meet with the approval of many schools of thought. But the present professor of psychology in the University of London has lately written that although such a position "would be derided by many psychologists who believe that the 'human nature' common to all cultures is not worth serious study", he adds that "the signs are that others are coming to consider it more seriously".<sup>2</sup> Different cultures may distort, transform or repress these basic natural facts—the anthropologists are constantly coming up with new examples of this—but one may indicate some broad trends.

The family community is basically an environment and as such it is experienced by its members. For the family, to quote Father Gilby, "is not a multitude united, as citizens are, *juris consensu*: it may have started as a contract between two people, but they, and their progeny, are presently involved in situations better settled by sympathy than by any effort of reason. Children are best cherished from tenderness and punished in hot-blood". This environment is a network of relationships, of influences, of values, and of traditions which, for the most part, are not made active or effective in any conscious fashion. Mutual affection, religious practice or indifference, political beliefs, for example, are part of the milieu, as much part as the air which the family breathes. The reactions of the members of the family to one another and to the current of life outside the family is part of the being of the family: the infant shares in this being long

<sup>1</sup> *Catholic Documents*, xi, p. 25.

<sup>2</sup> D. W. Harding, *Social Psychology and Individual Values*, p. 42.

before it is conscious of it or before it has any intellectual comprehension of what it means: one of the symptoms of the adolescent's desire to express his nascent independence may very well be a revolt against the pressures of this family atmosphere. This sense of being, with each individual sharing in being and knowing that he is appreciated as part of it, the whole enlivened by affection and love, is what forms the solid basis of security in the family community. As Professor Harding has pointed out: "Those whose work and ambition brings them for much of their time into competitive conflict with their fellows are naturally subject to a strong pull back towards simple fellowship and a social situation in which they can lose some of the insecurity that extreme competitiveness engenders. Many find a semblance of that situation in sociable drinking, where the lulling and loosening effects of alcohol, strongly supported by conventions of *bonhomie* and mutual trust, give them a sense of being at one with the sort of people they have been trying to out-sharp all day. Another expression of these regressive longings is found in the sentiments about 'home' and the 'old folks' that are always current in one or other of our popular songs."<sup>1</sup>

In the relationships between the children and their parents we may consider first that between the father and child. At the outset we may note that the relation of paternity is an intellectual relation, i.e. it is something which is known by the mind alone and has no admixture of sense in it. This is one of the fundamental differences between it and motherhood. The father is told that this morsel of flesh is his child; for the mother it is part of herself that she has known in her own flesh, and which continues to be related to her by fleshly bonds so long as she nurses it. But during this whole period—the pre-history and the early history of the child—the father is not affected in his physical self. In fact if the father disappeared after the child's conception, everything would still happen in the same way. He is the begetter of the child—this does not make him the father. The relationship of fatherhood is a spiritual, an intellectual one. There is no physical basis for an instinctive taking up of position, as there is in the case of the mother. This relationship differs according to the sex of the child: it is not the same between

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., p. 72.

father and daughter as it is between father and son. In the latter there may already be a latent rivalry which may become more apparent as the son grows up, like yet different, perhaps opposed to him as he in his time had been towards his own father. It is significant that as society, and particularly the State, concerns itself more and more with the defence of the child, the role of provider, defender and protector is transferred from the father to the State. Herr Bednarik became aware of this in the course of his researches among the young workers of post-war Vienna. "The young worker of today," he writes, "in his detached attitude towards the state and its social institutions, is like a son who is always demanding and taking; and the only reason why he has not become totally estranged from his father is that he is obliged at least to listen to his orders and admonitions, if only the better to circumvent them."<sup>1</sup> He even goes so far as to speak of socialized "father-hate". The effect of father-son relationships may be far reaching and lasting, going right on into adult life. Thus "a child whose relationship with his father has been unhappy, whose need and desire to respect, admire and love the father has been thwarted and replaced by resentment, jealousy or a sense of betrayal, will find every relationship with older men, or those charged with authority, an exceedingly challenging and difficult one. Sometimes a lifetime will not be enough to enable such a person to make a better adjustment to this emotional predicament, which burdens him constantly with the threat and the shadow of far-off, half-remembered days whose present impact he may well deny".<sup>2</sup>

A father's relationship with his daughter is rather different for although there is the same resemblance as with the son there is the added value of the difference of sex. Everyone has the recessive characteristics of the other sex, and man needs to perfect himself in the image of himself in a feminine being. A married man finds this to some extent in his wife—but only to some extent, because she is at once too near to him and too remote. She is too near because they are two in one flesh, she is remote because she is not sufficiently like him. But it is quite other with his daughter. This is not the first time he has found

<sup>1</sup> K. Bednarik, *The Young Worker of To-Day*, p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> D. Stafford-Clark, *Psychiatry To-Day*, p. 75.



himself and loved himself in a feminine being; that was already the case with his mother. But this is something greater and more magnificent: for he is now mirrored in a feminine being whom he has begotten. This relationship will go through many more phases of change than will the bond with his son: for the girl-child changes far more than the boy. The adolescent is a prolongation of the boy, the young man doing his military service is a prolongation of the adolescent, the young husband is a prolongation of the young man. But the young lady in her teens is very different from the little girl, the young wife is different again, and still more so the young mother. The relationship changes but seldom does the friendship break down. From the daughter's side the father, if he keeps her respect, represents something almost patriarchal or royal. In her *Histoire d'une âme* the Little Flower reveals something of the possibilities of this relationship between father and daughter, accentuated in her case by the early death of her mother. Each of them adored the other, and he seemed to have had some premonition of her destined suffering and glory. Each saw clearly in the other what even those closest to them seemed to see only obscurely.

To turn now to the relationship between child and mother. We have already noticed how this is based on a physical fact which creates the relationship—although the very thing which helps this relationship in the first years of a child's life may very well complicate it in later years. This can best be stated in the words of Dr Stafford-Clark: "From birth until about the age of four, the whole of the child's emotional needs and their expression and satisfaction are centred on the mother. It is as though the child were still in many ways contained within the mother, in so far as her personality and her feelings intervene of necessity between the child and his experience of any form of outside reality, and may powerfully influence his response to such experience." As the child comes to distinguish between "me" and "not-me", the one stable and constant element is recognized as the mother—and so she becomes the indispensable link between "me" and everything else. As other relationships begin to be formed, both within and without the family circle, they depend "both for their quality and their quantity upon the family structure and endure only as long as the central relation-



ship with the mother supports and encourages them". Yet this central relationship is in no way dependent on the physical care or neglect of her child by the mother. In the recently published *The Prevention of Cruelty to Children* by Leslie Housden there is a chapter by Dr Robert W. L. Ward on "The Hopeless Home". He writes of "a household in which meals are never cooked or taken round a table; where the children have scabies, impetigo, and eczema at the same time, are infested with vermin, have never been taught to use the lavatory, and sleep beneath old rags on mattresses that are sodden and writhing with maggots; where the empty milk bottles are allowed to collect until they total 208 and where the household equipment does not include a single brush, shovel, dishcloth, saucer, teapot or kettle . . . (Yet) in such a home there can be a strong bond of affection between mother and children (who) will resent and suffer from separation". One would not wish to exaggerate the incidence of such conditions—indeed in the recent Spence Family Survey made of 1,000 representative families on Tyneside the conclusion arrived at was that "at least 80 per cent of all mothers cared for their children in a constantly capable manner and never fell below adequate standards, and only 9 per cent of mothers were regarded as unable to cope".

The importance of a balanced mother-child relationship cannot be over-estimated. I say balanced advisedly because it may be upset by either excess or deficiency in care and affection. There is the mother who neglects her child and whose negligence is a more or less hidden form of rejection. Her rejection may not necessarily be of the kind which will cause the child, by order of a Court, to be taken from her. She may manifest it by setting impossible standards for the child, by being hypercritical and by making it clear to the child that it can never win her love. At the opposite end of the scale is the mother who is too loving. She is usually emotionally under-developed, her development arrested at a childish or infantile level, and she covets her children as objects for her love. This emotional orgy can go a long way towards sapping any desire for independence on the part of the child, and can be especially harmful to her sons who, if they marry, expect the same emotional floods from their wives. Independence in the child is also stunted by the mother who is too

protective. Unconsciously she has rejected her motherhood, but is driven by a strong sense of guilt to go to the other extreme, where the child is kept in cotton-wool and is not allowed to develop by measuring itself against the trials and difficulties of life. This is particularly distressing when the child reaches adolescence, for at that stage in its growth its personal development and social adjustment depend on the satisfaction of its human need for recognition (as a person on the threshold of adult life), for adventure and for opportunities of growth.

In many ways it may seem that the mother-child relationship is at the heart of the family community but this is not correct, for priority, both in time and in importance, must be given to the husband-wife relationship which with the advent of children is transformed into the father-mother relation. The foundation of the family community is the expressed will of man and woman to be together, to live together, to have a home in common. It is a community based on love, the love which seeks unity as its end, and in which the complementary nature of the powers and potentialities of the human couple play a very necessary part. The manifestation and incarnation of that unity is their child. Children complete the community, consecrate the marriage bond and turn union into unity, and unity into a unit. The relationship of husband and wife is no longer exclusively towards one another but is a shared regard for a third person—and their love is strengthened by a common experience of hopes and fears. Obviously the relationship between husband and wife changes with the growth of their children and still more with their own advance in age. To deal with it faithfully and thoroughly would require a separate essay, and one cannot do better than refer the reader to the chapter on "The Development of Love" in M. Jean Guittou's magnificent *Essay on Human Love*.

Part of the tissue of relationships that make the family is between the children themselves. One of the chief needs which is satisfied by membership of any community—most of all by membership of the radical family community—is acceptance by the group—acceptance which is shown by love, admiration and appreciation, both given and received. This the child must find in part in the company of his brothers and sisters, for in their recognition of him resides a certain element of his own assurance. It is not that he expects the sympathy of the others; rather

should one refer to what St Thomas, in his theory of love, calls *coaptatio* or *complacentia* which in turn refers to an order and is apprehended as a value which allows for greater or lesser degrees. This place which each one has in the affection and estimation of the others is the backcloth of all their mutual relations. Hence it is that so often the youngest in the family is the dictator of all of them—and that the elder is an example to the younger. It is not necessarily an example set consciously by the elder but a consciousness on the part of the younger that this or that attitude means what it is to be big, to be growing up. But brothers are not necessarily friends—they are too near to one another. They are often, despite superficial resemblances, very unlike. Even sometimes to the lengths of being opposites—Cardinal Newman's brother was a militant anti-Christian for a long period. War was originally between men as close as brothers—and yet when we speak of loving someone "as a brother" we mean "as much as possible". Nevertheless our Lord told us to love our neighbour as ourselves and not as a brother. The reason why appeal is made in politics to the ideal of brotherhood, of fraternity, is because it signifies the suppression of rivalry. It describes the situation where men have ceased to assert their self-centred demands and have merged themselves in a community. This surely is the sense of the scriptural "*Quam bonum et jocundum* . . . How good and delightful it is for brothers to be at one." It is good and delightful because it satisfies the three social desires: friendly contact with congenial people, the sense of having a function in one's group and the knowledge of social sanction for one's scale of values. Both in relations between brothers and in the relations between brothers and sisters is to be found a true school of social living. "Iron sharpeneth iron; so a man sharpeneth the countenance of his friend." These are all part of the community values where the mother, the source of love in the family community, suffuses the whole group with the right spirit.<sup>1</sup>

It is only rarely now—due chiefly to difficulties of accommodation—that grandparents can be counted members of a family community. This is part of the much greater problem of old

<sup>1</sup> There is a great deal more to be said, both from the sociological and the psychological points of view, about the child relationships in the family community. For further developments the reader is referred to the essays of MM. Guittou and Doucy in *Recherche de la Famille* (Editions Familiales de France) to which the writer is greatly indebted.

age. Professor Harding makes a sound point when he writes: "It seems likely that the root of the difficulty lies in a deeply entrenched feature of western societies: the tremendously high value placed on the individual's contribution to the material prosperity of the group, in spite of the lip-service paid to other values, such as art, scholarship, religion, social wisdom, moral development. There is consequently a great over-emphasis on the middle period of life, the period of fertility in women and material productiveness in men. Childhood is viewed as a preliminary to this period and old age as at best an aftermath."<sup>1</sup> There *are* some advantages in this attitude and I would be inclined to say that a great deal of the sympathy that one finds between a grandfather and grandchild comes precisely from this resemblance: that they are both outside time. Hence the frankness with one another which leaps a generation. On the side of the child there is the fact that veneration comes far more naturally to us than does obedience.

At meal-times the members of the family between whom there are these complex relations of the common life assemble round the common table. One may follow the almost unanimous opinion of sociologists in interpreting this phenomenon as a rite of mystical communion which symbolizes the close solidarity of the members of the group. At meals the family environment should reveal a kind of communication which is proper to itself. First of all let me say that the symbolism should be underplayed—hungry people are not bothered about the spiritual significance of satisfying their appetite. I would place the importance in the manner or gesture of distributing the food—it is something which is properly speaking maternal—the community is nourished by the mother. And this bears less resemblance to the calculations of a Minister of Food than to the miracle of the loaves and the fishes. (And how many mothers would not say *Hear, hear* to that!) It is a sharing out of the very substance of being in a providential way—so that when all are satisfied there is still more to come—at the next meal! Hence to look at another's plate complainingly or enviously is not merely bad manners, it is a rupture of the community, because it signifies an almost sacrilegious doubt of the maternal generosity of life. It is a break

<sup>1</sup> Op. cit., p. 74.

in the confidence which all have, or should have, in the distributor of good things. Moreover each has his place at the table, which implies that he has his place in the community—in the being of the family. Conversation has its important part to play in this too—in fact it makes the family environment because it is the enemy of isolation and is the outward sign of communication.

There are three fundamental communities: the domestic family, the parish and the monastic family (with which one may associate religious communities in general). The two latter are analogues of the domestic family which is the elementary human reality. It revolves round the facts of birth, life and growth. It assures to man his everyday life: roof, food, clothes, the rudiments of knowledge and of human relations. The parish is the centre of spiritual life, and we are born into the parish family by baptism. The parish answers the elementary and daily needs of those who belong to it: it is the environment of one's personal life of grace. In it one acquires the elements of Christian knowledge, and the central act of union is Communion, all sharing the same inexhaustible Sacred Banquet of the Holy Eucharist. Parallel to birth and baptism is religious profession whereby a religious joins a community, a community which is not a theoretical ideal but a practical example of the family impregnated with the Christian faith and liturgy. In it the common meal is the sign of the natural community, the domestic family; the liturgy is the sign of the supernatural community, the parish. In the monastery the courtesies and the almost sacramental character of meals in the refectory, with the father (abbot) presiding, are the exemplar of the love, friendship and sharing which should be found in the domestic family, but which here are supernaturalized. The one is example for the other, for if families are to be made into true communities then it must be done for supernatural motives and with the realization that it is a work that transcends time and the limitations of the human condition for, in the words of T. S. Eliot:

There is no life that is not in community,  
And no community not lived in praise of God.

JOHN FITZSIMONS

F

CHRIST, THE SECOND ADAM<sup>1</sup>

CONFRONTED with the doctrine of original sin our human minds protest. Or perhaps in complacency we do not realize the full force of this mystery. Some aspects of it are not too difficult. However deep our regret at the initial calamity of the human race, the simple assertion that by the sin of Adam mankind lost a certain number of free gifts is intelligible enough. Again, although we wistfully look back on Paradise, a humble awareness of our bodily natures and of their material composition leads us to accept resignedly the pain and the disease, the suffering and the death, which are the present lot of men. The struggle of flesh and spirit within ourselves is more serious in character, and this drag on our spiritual activity with the frequent degradation of our higher selves it brings is apt to make us question the wisdom and goodness of God; or at least it causes us bewilderment at the apparent lopsidedness of the divine plan. But there is more than all this. We do not merely inherit these consequences of Adam's sin, we inherit that sin. We are born not only in a state of impoverishment but in a state of guilt; we come into the world estranged from God by sin. Such is the dogma of original sin as defined in the Council of Trent: there is handed down from Adam to all his natural descendants, except Mary, a sin, a true sin, not simply the penalties of sin.

At once the mind jibs. How can we be blamed for what we did not do? Who can be culpable for what was not within his choice? Can sin be inherited? Let us beware here of turning the mystery which this truth is into the absurdity which it is not. God does not hold us responsible for Adam's personal sin. He does not in any way pretend that we committed it. Original sin does not make us culpable before God of any act of sin. The act of sin involved in this issue was committed by Adam alone; we inherit the state of sin resulting from that act.

It is impossible to understand the meaning of this without a widening of the perspective. The determining factor in the moral order is the ultimate destiny of man. It is that which is

<sup>1</sup> A conference given to the University of London Catholic Society, at St Etheldreda's, Ely Place, 20 November 1955.

the primordial principle of a moral life. What is in accord with that destiny is good and what goes against that destiny is moral evil or sin. To be on the way to one's destiny, to possess the rectitude that places one's condition and activity in its direction, is to be in a state of righteousness before God; to be out of harmony with one's destiny, to lack such a rectitude and such a direction, to be turned towards another end, is to be in a state of sin before God. In the present order the destiny of man is the share in the divine life and happiness given by the beatific vision. That is man's sole destiny—there is no other—and it is a destiny beyond his reach for which he requires with an absolute necessity the grace of God. For man then to be without grace is not simply the lack of an adornment; it is the privation of an essential moral factor, so that the absence of grace is by that very fact a state of sin—a state in which man is without the basic moral rectitude which orientates him to his ultimate destiny and thereby makes a virtuous life possible.

To return now to Adam. Sin and grace are incompatible. By his rebellion against God, Adam lost his endowment of grace; he was left in a state of aversion from God. Without grace, in a state of sin, he was helpless before the demands of a virtuous life. Deprived of grace, he found his one and only destiny absolutely beyond his grasp. Still, it was his own choice; the cause of his pitiful state was his own personal act. But why did this calamitous state of sin stretch out its tentacles and embrace us too? It did so because God had decreed that the grace necessary to put us on a level with our destiny should reach us through our descent from Adam. Adam's loss in that way became our own. Grace had been given at the origin of the human race to be handed down with human nature itself to all men. The rebellion of our first parents deprived the entire human race at its source of the grace essential to it for its moral destiny. All men are born without grace; by that fact all are born in a state of sin. In truth this is not the positive aversion from God that results from a personal individual sin; but it remains an absence of righteousness in regard to human destiny that is a moral evil or sin. Man is found helpless before his destiny and before the exigencies of a true moral life.

The mind remains disquieted. The mystery of original sin is



the mystery of our solidarity in grace with Adam, and, in the last analysis, that solidarity is due to a free decree of God. We are indeed one with Adam by natural descent, but that is not enough to explain our oneness with him in the bestowal of grace. However fitting this might be, God could have decreed it otherwise. In actual fact God willed that grace should reach man through his natural descent; he established thereby a solidarity in grace between us and Adam. What causes disquiet is that He did this with the knowledge that Adam would sin, and thus by divine permission the entire human race was plunged by the act of one man into the state of sin and left helpless before its destiny. There lies the mystery of original sin.

Now God did not make known to us this sombre truth until after the coming of Christ. Its first revelation is to be found in St Paul in a passage concerned with the salvation brought by Jesus Christ. Certainly, the Book of Genesis had described the original disaster, presenting it as the reason for the existing wretched condition of mankind. Again, the subsequent ravages made by sin amongst men had been frequently bewailed in the Scriptures. None the less it remains true that not until Paul do we find a clear statement that we inherit from Adam sin itself, and not merely the penalties and consequences of sin. In the fifth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans Paul makes an antithesis between Christ and Adam in order to drive home the truth of our salvation in Christ. And it is in this perspective, that of Christ's redemptive work, that the meaning of the Fall is first made plain. The ruin brought about by the first Adam was understood in its full magnitude only in the light of its reparation by the second Adam, Jesus Christ. Let us listen to the words of St Paul: "So, then, as through one offence condemnation came to all men, so also through a single justifying act there cometh to all men life-giving justification. As through the disobedience of the one man the many were constituted sinners, so also through the obedience of the one the many shall be constituted just . . . where sin hath been multiplied, grace hath abounded yet more, that, as sin hath reigned in death, so also grace may reign through justness unto life everlasting through Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. v, 18-21).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Westminster Version.



There is a telling significance in the manner of this divine revelation of original sin. It shows us where we must seek the solution to the troubling enigma that this doctrine offers to our human minds, namely in Christ the Redeemer. Adam's sin was indeed a fact of human free-will; for God's positive will cannot bear even indirectly on moral evil. It took place, however, under the permission and all-embracing providence of God, and God knew all that it involved. He allowed it in spite of its disastrous effects because He willed to make it the occasion of a communication of His goodness, an outpouring of His gifts, far surpassing all that had gone before. The mystery of Jesus Christ! Who can pierce its depths? God the Son made man: a union between God and a created human nature, between the Infinite and the finite, so close that a man, one of our own race, can say, I am God. God the Son made man for us: the Only-Begotten of the Father leaves aside His glory to become one with sinful humanity; He shares our life with its limitations and our sufferings even to distress of spirit; and then He offers Himself as our redemptive sacrifice on the Cross. Jesus Christ, our Head, our Priest, our King: it is He who dominates the providential plan of God. It is to Him that Christian writers of all ages point when they wish to reconcile the permission of original sin with the wisdom and goodness of Almighty God. In doing so they are but formulating in measured terms what the Church proclaims in her paschal shout of joy: *O certe necessarium Adae peccatum, quod Christi morte deletum est! O felix culpa, quae talem ac tantum meruit habere Redemptorem!* "O truly needful sin of Adam, which was blotted out by the death of Christ! O happy fault, that merited so great a Redeemer!" And St Francis de Sales comments: "ruin brought us profit, since in effect human nature has received more graces by its Saviour redeeming, than ever it would have received by Adam's innocence, if he had persevered therein".<sup>1</sup>

There is a parallelism in contrast between the dogma of original sin and the dogma of the redemption. The former tells us of a first Adam, the head of the human race, and of our oneness with him—a oneness that led to sin and death; the latter

<sup>1</sup> *Treatise on the Love of God*, 2, 5. Translated by the Rev. Henry Benedict Mackey, O.S.B.

of a second Adam, the new head of mankind, and of our oneness with Him—a oneness that leads to grace and life eternal. The first Adam as he left the hands of God was himself a mystery, with a life that lies outside our natural ken. Placed in the state of original justice, endowed with grace and other gifts, he enjoyed a life and happiness that went far beyond the requirements of a mere human existence and raised him to a share in the very life of God. Then as an extension of this, as a pendant to it, there is the mystery of our solidarity with him—a solidarity that became through Adam's rebellion a sharing not in life but in sin and death. The second Adam is himself a mystery, but in an incomparably greater way than the first. "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us" (John i, 14). The personal mystery of the second Adam is the wonderful fact of the Incarnation with all the consequences that flow from this. Among these there are the infinite dignity and value of every action of Christ, and above all His love for men which led Him to the sacrifice of the Cross—a love so great because it was the human expression and fulfilment of the merciful love and will of the God who, as St John tells us, "is love" (1 John iv, 8). Then as a continuation of this mystery, as its complement in the decree of God, there is the mystery of our solidarity with Christ whereby we are made sharers in His life and grace. Like our oneness with Adam, our oneness with Christ depends in the last analysis on the free ordinance of God, and in that gratuitous decree lies the core of the mystery of our redemption. God willed that our salvation should depend on the life and sacrifice of Jesus Christ, a new head of the human race in whom mankind was to be reassembled. By His Providence He made this possible and He put this plan into effect. As He had linked us to the first Adam so now He bound us to the second Adam, and in Christ and only in Christ is salvation to be found. "Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv, 12). Such is the inescapable law of our salvation, but a law that is an expression of love and mercy on the part of God "who will have all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth" (1 Tim. ii, 4), a law the wisdom and fitness of which will be a source of joy and thanksgiving to us throughout eternity.

The mystery of the redemption has not yet been completed; the unfolding of God's plan of salvation is still taking place in the midst of us today. The Almighty with that delicate respect He shows towards men did not will to save man without his personal assent and co-operation. Hence, our oneness with Christ is realized in two distinct stages. At the origin of all the rest there is that radical solidarity, decreed by God, which makes the life and sacrifice of Christ the principle and source of salvation for the entire human race. In virtue of this, Christ's death and resurrection were for us; Christ went before us as our Leader, and the value of His work, the grace it brings, was the means that made it possible for us to follow Him. But it still remains for us to follow Him. In this phase comes the second level of solidarity—that effective incorporation of each of us personally and of all of us collectively in Christ Jesus whereby His life is made actually present in us and His redemptive power intrinsically renovates and revivifies our souls. This is the oneness with Christ found realized in His mystical Body, the Church; and that Church is the issue of the redemption, the new Assembly of God, the new People and the new Mankind with the second Adam at its head.

For those who see with the eyes of faith, the course of human history presents a meaning unsuspected or unheeded by the thinkers of this world. Its centre is Jesus Christ. All that went before prepared for His coming, and the important events of history took place in an insignificant little people whose religious development the rise and fall of great empires were in the purpose of God made to serve. After Christ the true significance of history is found in the progressive gathering of the new People of God, the gradual incorporation of men who accept His grace into their new Head, the second Adam. When this task is completed according to the mysterious design of God, Jesus Christ will return in glory to take full and visible possession of His People. All will then be brought to its achievement. Such is the magnificent vision of St Paul: "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ all shall be made to live. But each in his own order: Christ the firstfruits, then they that are Christ's shall rise, at his coming; then shall be the end, when he shall surrender the kingdom to God the Father, when he shall have brought to

naught all other rule and all other authority and power. . . . And when all things shall be subject to him, then shall the Son himself be subject to the Father who subjected all things to him, that God may be all in all" (1 Cor. xv, 22-8).<sup>1</sup>

CHARLES DAVIS

---

### CIRCUMDATA VARIETATE

#### ECCLESIASTICAL LACE

THE importance of costume in social life is being increasingly recognized, as may be gathered, for example, from works such as Trevelyan's *Illustrated English Social History* of some few years ago. The trend of fashion would appear to correspond in some degree to the spirit of the age, and fashion in its turn would seem to leave its own special imprint on the character of its time.

There might seem little room for any variation in clerical fashion. The vestments of the sacred liturgy have long since become standardized and possess their own symbolic meaning. Styles have altered little, though in recent years there has been a tendency to revert to the more ample modes of mediaeval times.

The everyday dress of the cleric out of doors is still in many continental countries that *vestis talaris* which may be described as the foundation garment of the ecclesiastic's wear. In English-speaking countries it is for the most part some form of that "vestis nigri vel subnigri coloris" which was prescribed by the first Westminster Synod in 1852. The synodal Fathers wished the clergy to be distinguished in dress both from the laity and from non-Catholic ministers of religion. Hence they particularly stressed the importance of wearing the Roman collar which was, they said, the "peculiare insigne cleri catholici per totum fere orbem". Nowadays the Roman collar without is no certain sign of the true priestly character within.

<sup>1</sup> The Westminster Version.

In the event, clerics wore a form of frock-coat not radically different from that which was the ordinary dress of the Victorian professional man. When, after the First World War, the professions discarded the ugly and cumbersome long coat, save only for very formal occasions, the cleric stopped short at the garment truthfully if inelegantly described as the "*vestimentum superius*" which "*pertingere debet saltem ad extremos digitos, manibus deorsum porrectis*". Of late years the clergy in many dioceses have taken to ordinary lounge suits, apparently with the tacit approval of authority, without in any way being guilty of sporting those "*elegantiores et mundaniores vestium formas quarum numerus in dies crescunt*". A slim young cleric in his twenties clad in a Chesterfield, and looking rather like a trainee undertaker, is more likely to cause *admiratio* than if he wore a black lounge suit of sober cut. Adequately to fill a Chesterfield requires that more robust dignity which comes only with age, weight and high position.

There is little scope here for the would-be ecclesiastical fashion designer. Where he, more often she, has a field day is in the sacristy, especially in the trimming of albs and surplices which are supposed to lend themselves admirably to adornment either by needlework or the addition of lace.

Lace figures largely in the history of costume and has been the occasion of many of the old-time sumptuary laws against extravagance in dress. Garments taken from ancient tombs in Egypt and Assyria show a fringe work which may have been the beginning of lace decoration. It is thought that this network may have had a religious significance as miniature figures of deities have been found fastened to some specimens. Homer makes reference to nets of woven gold, and the dandified Nero wore a net of gold threads. Centuries later his partner in cruelty, the English Henry VIII, was the proud possessor of "an edging of lace made of purple silk and ornamented with gold" which had been imported from Italy.

In England needlework appears on altar frontals as early as the Anglo-Saxon period. Then, as in later Norman times, some kind of network was often used to trim the robes both of nobles and ecclesiastics. In the later Middle Ages and in Renaissance times much use was made of Greek Point Lace on their wearing

apparel by the upper classes including the clergy. Church cloths of various kinds, and even shrouds, were decorated with this work. From personal attire and bed hangings it spread to vestments and altar frontals, often depicting angels, saints and armorial quarterings.

In the Low Countries lace-making dates from at least the end of the fifteenth century. An altar piece in Louvain by Quentin Mastys, dating from 1495, shows a girl making pillow lace with the aid of bobbins. Brussels lace became famous, and the great Napoleon in one of his more amiable moods ordered lace albs there for presentation to the Sovereign Pontiff. Although St Bridget is reputed to have introduced the art to Sweden in the early fourteenth century, and although in Spain at a later date lace was often used on occasion of high festival, chiefly for adorning the robes of cherished Madonnas, it is in Italy and France that the lace industry is found best established.

Italy exported a great deal of its lace to France during the reigns of Louis XIII and Louis XIV. But at home there was also a steady demand for it, mostly for ecclesiastical purposes. The French ambassador in Venice, Bishop de Bonzy, told Colbert that practically all the convents and poorer families made their living by lace. In Louis XIII's reign, the demand for Italian lace far exceeded the supply. Rank and wealth were alike indicated by the amount of lace worn on collars, cuffs, scarves, gloves, and even boots. In the seventeenth-century France male and female costume was swamped with lace, nor were churchmen behind in this self-decoration with flimsy webs more suited to the boudoir than the sanctuary.

At an earlier period lace ruffs were all the fashion with men. Many of them were so extravagant that their wearers are said to have resembled the head of the Baptist on a charger, and it is on record that soup spoons had handles up to two feet in length so that gentlemen who dressed *à la mode* might dine in reasonable comfort. Men's dress in France continued to be elaborately adorned with lace right up to the Revolution. Louis XVI, for example, had fifty-nine pairs of lace ruffles, and the archbishop of Cambrai was possessed of forty-eight pairs in Mechlin, Point de France and Valenciennes.

With the Revolution came greater simplicity in dress. Lace was used less by men and came to be regarded as fit only for the adornment of women's costume. It was left to ecclesiastics to continue a tradition which would have been better ended. With the Revolution, also, came the era of machine-made lace. Britain gave the lead, to be speedily followed by France. But by the middle of the nineteenth century both countries had been surpassed by Belgium. Naturally the new lace found its way into the sacristy. Albs and surplices were now not only fussy and effeminate but positively ugly.

Ruskin, speaking of the introduction of machine-made lace, said that "the real good of a piece of lace . . . is that it should show first that the designer had a pretty fancy; next, that the maker of it had fine fingers; lastly, that the wearer of it had worthiness or dignity enough to obtain what is difficult and common sense enough not to wear it on all occasions". That clerics find it difficult to observe the last of these suggestions is evident from the replies of the Sacred Congregation of Rites. A study of replies to questions on the wearing of lace suggests an anxiety on the part of individuals to wear more than becomes their rank, and a bland disregard for those occasions on which it may fittingly be worn.

The principles laid down by manualists on the wearing of lace, namely that it is a mark of festivity and that its depth indicates the rank of the wearer, are not to be found stated as such by the Sacred Congregation of Rites. They are derived from replies such as those prescribing plain linen at requiem functions; or limiting the amount of lace to be worn by certain dignitaries; or from the "tolerari posse" which is the usual answer to requests for permission to wear lace with a coloured foundation on the sleeves of albs and rochets.

Thus for example, we have the constitution *Ad incrementa* of 1934 forbidding lace to be worn on their rochets by the members of the four Roman colleges of prelates at times of mourning. Replies of the S.C.R. 3780 ad 5 and 4048 (12 July 1892 and 24 November 1899) allow ("tolerari possit") lace with a coloured foundation on the sleeves and bodies of albs. On rochets, however, the foundation colour should be the same as that of the cassock appropriate to the dignitary concerned.



Canons are allowed on more solemn feasts to wear albs with lace from the waist (S.C.R. 3804, 12).

Nor is the amount of lace on the rochet left to the individual taste of the wearer. In England, canons of cathedral chapters were originally given a choir dress (designed by Cardinal Wiseman and approved by Pius IX) of a black mozetta to be worn over a surplice. At Oscott the portrait of the eighth President, Canon Moore, shows him in this dress. But a Brief of 14 May 1858 prescribed a new canonical dress, also requested by Wiseman. This consisted of a violet cassock for the metropolitan chapter and black cassocks for suffragan chapters, with a violet fur-trimmed mozetta to be worn over a rochet "*cum fimbrio vulgo Merletto . . . duodecim pollices mensurae Anglicae per altitudinem minime excedente. . .*" Similar Briefs of 1953 relating to the choir dress of the new chapters of Paisley and Motherwell likewise prescribed that the canons "*. . . sese induere valeant . . . superpelliceo manicato seu rochetto cum fimbria seu texto denticulato non magis duodecim pollices alto, iuxta anglicum metiendi modum. . .*" One concludes that clerics who are of lower degree than canons should wear less, and not more, lace on their surplices. Experience, however, proves that on an average the majority of surplices supplied to priests have lace to the extent of twenty inches or thereabouts.

It is certainly astonishing that men who would indignantly repudiate any suggestion of effeminacy in the rest of their wearing apparel yet feel themselves apparently undressed unless they attend liturgical functions looking rather like a Victorian window. And the rare priest who is found wearing a plain, much more so a full, surplice, must be prepared to listen repeatedly to the tiresome jest that he has "gone all Anglican". The truth is, of course, that the Protestant Church of England took over the surplice it found in use at the time of the Reformation. Not only did the Catholic pre-Reformation clergy wear the plain linen surplice that finds its dignity in its admirable proportions, but prelates also wore plain rochets. There are many portraits extant both of Continental and English dignitaries showing them without a vestige of lace on their choir dress. At the Portuguese Art Exhibition opened at the Royal Academy in October 1955, in connexion with the state visit of



the President of Portugal, one of the outstanding exhibits was the polyptych of the *Veneration of St Vincent* painted by Nuno Gonçalves between 1465 and 1467. The bishop there has an appressed alb, and the servers wear long linen surplices not unlike those prescribed by St Charles Borromeo a century later.

Melozzo da Forlì's well-known painting of Sixtus IV appointing Platina his librarian, shows the Pontiff in a long plain linen rochet, and Ghirlandaio's *Funeral of St Fina* depicts both bishop and attendants in plain linen without any lace, and this in the full tide of the Renaissance. The Popes Julius II and Paul III are painted by Raphael and Titian respectively both in linen rochets without lace.

Among English prelates we have Cardinal Pole as shown by del Piombo, Cranmer painted by Fliccius, and the Trinity Hall portrait of Gardiner, all wearing plain rochets. The new Protestant clergy objected not to lace, which was obviously not worn in England to any great extent, but to the ordinary linen surplice as being too suggestive of Catholic ritual.

Father Philip Hughes has an entertaining footnote in his *Reformation in England* (III, p. 160) telling how "on March 26, 1566, Parker had the whole of the London clergy before him at Lambeth, Grindal sitting with him, and the rector of Bow Church functioning as a clerical mannequin, clad to show how all must be clad". Of 110 clergy present, 37 were unwilling to wear the surplice, and these were immediately suspended and threatened with deprivation of their livings if they did not submit within three months. To suggest, therefore, that the wearing of the traditional English full linen surplice smacks of heresy is, to say the least, unhistorical.

One must sorrowfully confess that in this matter of lace adornment bad taste is rampant. A large gathering of priests, at a clergy funeral for example, shows an extraordinary variety of surplices surely never contemplated, still less ordered, by the Sacred Congregation of Rites. There are priests who billow in lace from the shoulders, the only linen on their persons being the yoke to which the lace is fastened. Others have a proportion of about one-third linen to two-thirds lace. This often nearly meets the hem of a short slip cassock which would not suffer from being lengthened by another foot or so. Other priests prefer

crochet. In itself this is often of excellent workmanship, but successive layers of crochet disposed upon a man's person make him resemble an outsize cover for an afternoon-tea cosy. One sees designs of distorted chalices, fancy and fantastic flowers, badly designed lettering and a host of other absurdities, all worked no doubt to the greater glory of God, but none the less detracting from the dignity of the worship we pay Him.

A new horror in these latter days is the surplice of nylon or allied thread. It is not altogether transparent, but it is certainly related to those ladies' nylons universally advertised as "sheer". One has seen a nylon surplice sporting small satin bows that possibly take the place of service stripes, and indicate completed lustra of years spent in the service of the Lord.

Albs share in this distressing attempt at adornment. It may be exceptional to sing a Requiem (as did the writer on one occasion) in a lace alb with crimson foundation, but possibly it is only at Requiems that plain albs are ever used. No one would quarrel with a bold simple design in needlework, or a good apparel, or even with lace of the best hand-made provenance, but an alb of good linen and generous proportions is able to hold its own with any of these more ornate productions. And certainly the best of linen albs is more than a match for the machine-made lace generally to be found in everyday use. Too often, however, the linen alb has its effect spoiled by skimpiness in the skirt, or by being accordion-pleated. The result is that instead of having a manly priestly vestment, the impression is given of petticoat stiffening awaiting an outer garment of some more flimsy material.

What is true of lace on surplices is equally true of lace on albs. Only good lace looks well and wears well, and even this ought not to be worn day in, day out. The experience of walking through wispy lace in front, or the unrubrical gyrations necessary to extract one's rubber heels from trailing finery behind, is not altogether isolated.

Nor does the craze for lace stop at the priestly vestments. Altar servers are similarly sent into the sanctuary displaying the most amazing variety of lace designs, much of it of appalling ugliness. There is lace on the hem, lace on the sleeves, and lace around the collar, giving the impression that the servers' sur-

plices had been hastily improvised from little girls' frocks and there had been no time to remove unsuitable trimmings.

One might have thought that with so many priests and servers carrying the maximum of lace on their persons, there would be no further opportunity of displaying it in public worship. This would be to underestimate the ingenuity of those who seem determined to change the altar of sacrifice and its surrounds into a decorated fancy stall with ecclesiastical affinities. Corporals, palls, purificators, finger-towels, all have their quota of lace. To complete the scheme, lace swathes the altar, and the credence-table cover resembles nothing so much as an afternoon-tea cloth artistically draped cornerwise, so that its lace border and insertion show to advantage.

Among the churches rebuilt after the war was one which had been designed by the great Pugin. It was restored as far as possible in accordance with the original design. All that survived from the old church was the high altar. This was a marble affair somewhat of the "wedding-cake" style which in any case scarcely did justice to the church. But its only chance of fitting in the new sanctuary was completely destroyed by the draping of the front with a yard and a half width of indifferent lace. Elsewhere a simple and dignified altar frontal had its whole effect ruined by having superimposed a length of lace which gave a fondly-imagined artistic effect.

In a recent publication on Westminster Cathedral mention is made of the ceremonies "the beauty and dignity of which epitomise the liturgical worship of the English Catholic". Outside some few of our cathedrals, our abbeys and very few indeed of our parish churches, this dignity is largely lost if only because of the bad taste that governs the decoration and furnishing of our altars, and the ornamentation of the albs and surplices worn by the clergy and servers.

The fashion which demands lace in all places on all occasions can hardly be said to claim rubrical support. Nor can it claim to be English. Dignity and sobriety will only be restored if priests themselves discard much of the second-rate finery they have so long suffered. Good lace may be found becoming on the rochets of canons and prelates, and even here one hopes it is not offensive to pious ears to suggest that plain linen would be even

more becoming. But for the "simplex sacerdos" as yet unburdened with any high ecclesiastical dignity, there seems no good reason why he should not appear more often in linen plain and unadorned. The priest who dares to venture into his sanctuary, or even more boldly into another's, clad in plain linen is in good company. In the Old Testament God himself designed linen tunics for the Aaronic priests. It was only the effeminate fashion of a foppish age which put men, including clerics, into lace. In throwing off what is now generally regarded as but feminine decoration, the clergy might well follow the example of the laity.

Are we making mountains out of molehills? As recently as 1952 the Holy Father himself legislated for ecclesiastical costume. True, he made no mention of lace, but when he ordered (*Motu Proprio Valde Solliciti*) that Cardinals should henceforth have no train to their cassocks, that their cappa magna be shortened by half, and that their purple robes be of wool and not silk (an order extended in part to all Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops, Protonotaries and other Prelates by a decree of the S.C.R. 4 December 1952), he gave as his reason for so doing "... ut omnes nempe, peculiari modo e sacro ordine viri, ad vivendi rationem magis sobriam, moderatam atque austeram compellantur". Moderation and a certain austerity are the ideals thus authoritatively recommended for ecclesiastical dress.

JOHN J. COYNE

---

## QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

### REJECTION OF NULLITY PLEA CONTRADICTING PRE-NUPTIAL DECLARATION

How far can the signing of the pre-nuptial enquiry form be invoked as a reason for estopping a plaintiff in the matrimonial courts? In particular, if a man, after the questions have been

explained to him by the priest, answers affirmatively to the question: "Do you both intend to contract marriage without any reservations or conditions to your consent?", can the court summarily throw out a plea of nullity which he later presents alleging that his consent was made dependent on an unfulfilled condition? (H.)

REPLY

Canon 1971, §1: "Habiles ad accusandum sunt: 1°. Conjuges, in omnibus causis separationis et nullitatis, nisi ipsi fuerint impedimenti causa."

The late Canon Mahoney might perhaps be quoted in support of the view that a plea of nullity can be summarily rejected, if it contradicts an affirmation made and signed by the plaintiff in the pre-nuptial enquiry form. The purpose of the question concerning a party's intention, he wrote, "is to prevent such a person from seeking later on a decree of nullity on the score of a defective intention against the substance of marriage. His signed answers, together with the priest's statement, will be an insuperable obstacle to any nullity suit in the courts of the Church".<sup>1</sup> And dealing with an imaginary case, he concludes: "The ecclesiastical court will obtain the two summaries and dossiers from the archives of St Luke's parish, Newton, which contain in writing signed by both parties the exact contrary to what they allege; their pleas are doomed to failure."<sup>2</sup> If these statements are to be taken as expressing a procedural norm, and not merely an estimate of practical probability, we find them difficult to defend.

i. If the plaintiff is "habilis ad accusandum", according to the norm of canon 1971, §1, 1°, the mere fact that his plea contradicts what he himself previously affirmed in his pre-nuptial enquiry form, is not, *in itself*, a sufficient ground for summary rejection of his *libellus*. Provided that the *libellus* of a competent plaintiff has been drawn up in canonical form, without substantial defect, and that the fact alleged would, if true,

<sup>1</sup> *Marriage Preliminaries*, n. 176.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, n. 208.

constitute a ground of nullity, the *libellus* can only be rejected if the allegation is itself patently false.<sup>1</sup> In the case under consideration, however, even though the plaintiff's claim be tantamount to an admission of previous falsehood, no presumption is thereby established, either in law or in fact, that his present allegation is likewise false. His credibility is certainly weakened, because, by his own confession, he is a deceiver; but deception is objectively involved whenever a party's internal consent is at variance with the words or signs used by him in the act of contracting marriage (canon 1086, §1), whether or not he has previously affirmed an intention of contracting unconditionally. The introduction of the signed pre-nuptial enquiry form has therefore not substantially altered the situation: it has merely made explicit what was already implicit in the law.

Nor does the signed evidence of the plaintiff's deceitfulness substantially affect his ability to prove his present claim, because, whether or not a plaintiff's word is deemed to be reliable, it can never constitute full proof, not even when it is confirmed by solemn oath.<sup>2</sup> In every case, it must be supported by extraneous and convincing evidence of documents, witnesses, presumptions, etc. Now, it is clear that even a liar can, by such evidence, convince the tribunal that his prenuptial statement was false and his present assertion true. If, therefore, he is competent to plead and his *libellus* indicates, with apparent credibility, that he can produce evidence confirmatory of his plea, it must be accepted for trial. If, on the other hand, it is evident from the *libellus* that his plea is unsupported by such evidence, it may and should be rejected, not because his word happens to be unreliable, but because his unsupported deposition is not proof.

ii. But, although the plaintiff's pre-nuptial statement does not of itself warrant the summary rejection of a contradictory plea, it may provide evidence that he is incompetent to plead. Canon 1971, §1, 1°, as subsequently interpreted, debars from acting as plaintiff any party who has been the *causa directa et dolosa* of the alleged nullity.<sup>3</sup> By his own confession, the party in

<sup>1</sup> *S.C. Sacram., Instr.*, 15 August 1936, articles 62, 64.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, art. 117.

<sup>3</sup> Code Commission, 27 July 1942 (*A.A.S.*, 1942, XXXIV, p. 241; *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, February 1943, p. 90).

question was the *causa directa* of the alleged nullity, and, provided that the pre-nuptial question about undeclared conditions was adequately explained to him, it may well show him to have been *causa dolosa*, more especially if the condition was clearly one which he would not have been permitted to attach. The tribunal must consider this question, and, if it is clear that he was gravely culpable in causing the nullity, must declare him incompetent to plead. In that event, the marriage can only be impugned through the intervention of the Promoter of Justice.

# TELEVISED MASS—FULFILMENT OF OBLIGATION

Is there any ground for holding that one can fulfil the Mass obligation on a Sunday or other feast of precept by devoutly viewing a televised Mass? It is understandable that the mere hearing of a Mass over the radio does not suffice, because the Mass is primarily an action, something done, rather than something said or sung. But the viewer is in visual contact with the action, more intimately indeed than most of those who are physically present, and his moral union with the celebrant is surely closer than that of some of those who are considered by moralists to be canonically "present at Mass", e.g. those outside the door of a crowded church, or on the fringe of a multitude assisting at an open-air Mass. (P.)

## REPLY

Canon 1249: "Legi de audiendo Sacro satisfacit qui Missae adest quocunque catholico ritu celebretur, sub dio aut in quacunq[ue] ecclesia vel oratorio publico aut semi-publico et in privatis coemeteriorum aediculis de quibus in can. 1190, non vero in aliis oratoriis privatis, nisi hoc privilegium a Sede Apostolica concessum fuerit."

Whether or not the viewing of an act approximates more to physical presence at it than to the mere hearing of its sound effects over the radio, it is quite certain that the viewing of a

televised Mass does not suffice for the fulfilment of the Mass obligation. The term "adest", in canon 1249, is universally taken to mean that, in order to fulfil the precept, one must be bodily present in or around the place where the Mass is being celebrated and in such fashion as to be morally united with the celebrant.<sup>1</sup> Authors differ as to what degree of physical proximity is necessary to moral union, but all agree that the required moral union must derive from physical presence. The man in the street, in the literal sense of the words, may be able to follow the progress of the Mass only by noting the reactions of those in the doorway, but, morally speaking, he is among those present and present physically. So too the man on the fringe of the crowd at an open-air Mass.

It might be objected that both the law and its interpretation derive from a time when moral union with an action was only possible to those physically present at it, but the question is not what the legislator might have willed, had he foreseen the advent of television, but what he did actually will, and he certainly willed bodily presence. That he has not changed his mind, in the light of events, is clear from a note published in the *Osservatore Romano*, 7 January 1954, to the following effect: "The superior ecclesiastical authorities, in response to a question put to them, have declared that, however laudable it may be to follow the celebration of Holy Mass by television, one does not thereby fulfil the precept of hearing Mass on feast days, according to the norm of canons 1248 and 1249 of the Code of Canon Law."<sup>2</sup> Nor is it intrinsically likely that the Church will change her attitude. Attendance at Mass on certain days is imposed on the faithful, not principally in order that they may see and hear what the Church is doing, but that they may fulfil their primary natural duty of offering worship to God publically and socially, as well as individually and internally. The viewer in the privacy of his home may be intimately united in spirit with Mass which is being offered, but only by physical presence at a public act of worship can he express his solidarity with the society on whose behalf it is offered.

<sup>1</sup> Cf., e.g., Noldin, *Summa Theol. Mor.*, II, n. 261; Genicot, *Institutiones Theol. Mor.*, I, n. 340.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from *Apollinaris*, 1954, XXVII, nn. 1-2, p. 73.



*AB ACATHOLICIS NATI—PATERNITY UNCERTAIN*

Mary was born, in 1910, the illegitimate child of a Catholic mother. It seems probable that her father was a non-Catholic, though this cannot be proved. In 1911, she was baptized in the Catholic Church, but in 1914, when her mother died, she was placed in a non-Catholic orphanage and brought up as a Protestant. In 1930, she married a Protestant in an Anglican church but subsequently, in 1945, she obtained a civil divorce. Now, in 1955, she wants to return to the Church of her baptism and marry a Catholic. Is she free to marry? (D.)

REPLY

Canon 1099, §1: "Ad statutam superius (scil. in can. 1094) formam servandam tenentur: 1° Omnes in catholica Ecclesia baptizati . . . , licet . . . ab eadem postea defecerint, quoties inter se matrimonium ineunt; 2° Idem, de quibus supra, si cum acatholicis . . . matrimonium contrahant;

§2: "Firmo autem praescripto §1, n.1, acatholici sive baptizati sive non baptizati, si inter se contrahant, nullibi tenentur ad catholicam matrimonii formam servandam; item ab acatholicis nati, etsi in Ecclesia catholica baptizati, qui ab infantili aetate in haeresi vel schismate aut infidelitate vel sine ulla religione adoleverunt, quoties cum parte acatholica contraxerint."

Code Commission, 20 July 1929: "D. An *ab acatholicis nati*, de quibus in canone 1099, §2, dicendi sunt etiam nati ab alterutro parente acatholico, cautionibus quoque praestitis ad normam canonum 1061 et 1071. R. Affirmative" (*A.A.S.*, 1929, XI, p. 573).

Since there is no other ostensible reason for questioning the validity of Mary's Protestant marriage, her freedom to marry again depends on whether or not it was invalid by defect of canonical form: and the answer to this depends in turn on whether she was bound, in virtue of her Catholic baptism, to observe the canonical form, according to canon 1099, §1, or was exempted from this obligation, in virtue of the circumstances

of her parentage and upbringing, by the *item ab acatholicis nati* clause of canon 1099, §2. As readers will be aware, this exempting clause was withdrawn as from 1 January 1949, inclusive;<sup>1</sup> but marriages contracted between the coming into effect of the Code and the end of 1948, as was Mary's, must be judged according to the then existing law, as authoritatively interpreted.

Three conditions were required by this law for the exemption of a person baptized in the Catholic Church from the obligation of observing the canonical form in marriage: non-Catholic parentage, *at least on one side*, non-Catholic education from infancy, and marriage to a non-Catholic. Mary certainly fulfilled the second and third of these conditions. As to the first, if her natural father was in fact a non-Catholic, as is said to be probable, she fulfilled that also. In that case, she was exempt from the obligation of the canonical form, and consequently her Protestant marriage was not invalid by defect of form. This conclusion will, of course, remain doubtful, as long as doubt remains about the religion of her father, but "*in dubio standum est pro valore matrimonii, donec contrarium probetur*" (canon 1014). Hence, until it is canonically established that her father, as well as her mother, was a Catholic, and therefore that she was bound by the canonical form, the presumption is that she is validly married and therefore not free to re-marry.

According to Dom G. Oesterle, O.S.B.,<sup>2</sup> a case similar to Mary's in every material respect, except that the petitioner was a man (Eugene) whose unmarried mother had expressly named a Protestant (James) as the natural father, came before an ecclesiastical tribunal in the United States of America. The unsupported statement of Eugene's mother could not of itself constitute judicially acceptable proof that his father was a Protestant, and therefore that, being *natus ab acatholico* and brought up as a non-Catholic, he was exempt from the canonical form and consequently married validly. But it was not for the tribunal to justify its presumption that the marriage was valid; that pre-

<sup>1</sup> Pius XII, *Motu Proprio*, 1 August 1948 (*A.A.S.*, 1948, XL, p. 305). From the beginning of 1949, all who have been baptized in the Catholic Church, or have been converted to it from heresy or schism, are bound under pain of invalidity to observe the canonical form when they marry, no matter what their parentage or upbringing. Cf. *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, November 1948, p. 341.

<sup>2</sup> *Monitor Ecclesiasticus*, 1953, f. II, p. 249.

sumption is established by canon 1014 and stands until the contrary is proved by the party contesting the validity. It was therefore for the Promotor of Justice, who had impugned the validity of this particular marriage *ex defectu formae*, to prove his claim; "onus probandi incumbit ei qui asserit" (canon 1748, §1). For this, it was not enough to point to the fact that the mother's assertion of a Protestant father remained unproved; lack of proof of an assertion does not constitute proof of the contrary. In order to establish that Eugene was bound by the canonical form, he needed to prove that the father, no less than the mother, was a Catholic. Apparently he failed to do so, because, according to Oesterle, the tribunal of first instance returned a verdict of *non constat de nullitate*, and this verdict was confirmed by the metropolitan court of appeal, 4 December 1951.

Father Oesterle attacks the verdict on the ground that the case involved a grave *dubium iuris* which neither tribunal was competent to solve: whether, namely, the term *ab acatholicis nati* refers only to children born of a non-Catholic or mixed marriage (as he confidently asserts), or applies equally to children born out of wedlock. Father L. Bender, O.P., somewhat hotly but, we feel, justly rebuts this attack.<sup>1</sup> As he rightly remarks, not only is Oesterle practically unique in his claim of a *dubium iuris*, but also his narrow interpretation of *ab acatholicis nati* is quite contrary to its natural meaning, whether usual or juridical. A child born of non-Catholic or mixed parents is equally *natus ab acatholicis*, whether they are married or not.<sup>2</sup> Parentage is a natural fact; paternity may be more difficult to establish juridically outside of wedlock, because there is no room for the juridical presumption of canon 1115, §1, but it can be established. Even, therefore, if the Promoter of Justice in the American case had anticipated Oesterle in claiming a *dubium iuris*, both tribunals would have been justified in rejecting it as unfounded, and in standing by their verdict of *non constat de nullitate*. The same verdict, we consider, would have to be returned in Mary's case, and with even stronger reason, if it were ever brought before an ecclesiastical tribunal. Meanwhile, it is clear from her

<sup>1</sup> *Angelicum*, XXXI, 1954, f. I, p. 46 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Mahoney, *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, November 1937, p. 423.

sad story and that of Eugene, why the Holy See eventually decided to withdraw the exempting clause. It was meant to save the validity of marriages, but has resulted mainly in head-aches for the tribunals and inconclusive verdicts for the parties.

#### ECCLESIASTICAL BURIAL— REPENTANCE OF PUBLIC SINNER

A Catholic woman who had lived for several years as the civil wife of a divorced man, and had in consequence ceased to practise her religion, died in the hospital of a neighbouring town, where she is said to have received the Last Sacraments. Her matrimonial situation was well known in her home parish, but not her reception of the Last Sacraments. Was she entitled to ecclesiastical burial? (R.)

#### REPLY

Canon 1239, §3: "*Omnes baptizati sepultura ecclesiastica donandi sunt, nisi eadem a iure expresse priventur.*"

Canon 1240, §1: "*Ecclesiastica sepultura privantur, nisi ante mortem aliqua dederint poenitentiae signa: . . . 6°. Alii peccatores publici et manifesti.*"

For baptized persons in general, ecclesiastical burial is not merely a privilege or favour to be conceded as a mark or reward of merit, but an obligation to be fulfilled as a sign of incorporation into the Church. Hence, it not only may, but must be given to all baptized persons, unless they are expressly deprived of it by law (canon 1239, §3); and since such deprivation is a penal exception to the general norm, it must be interpreted in the narrow sense, and must never be urged in cases of insoluble doubt (canon 1240, §2). Moreover, though the cause of deprivation is placed in life, the penalty itself is only conditionally incurred this side of death; those who, before dying, "have given some signs of repentance" escape it (canon 1240, §1).

It seems clear enough that the woman in the question had placed a cause of deprivation, because her public and sinful

union was known to be irremediable, and therefore there could be no ground for a common assumption that it had been convalidated. If, however, it be true that she gave signs of repentance before death, she escaped the penalty of her sin. In that case, she has a right to ecclesiastical burial as defined in canon 1204 (i.e. translation of the body to the church, the performance therein of the full exequial rite, and interment in consecrated ground), and those responsible for her burial have a duty to see that she receives it according to the law.<sup>1</sup> But since it is certain that she placed the cause of the penalty, her claim to exemption must be established.

Mere confession does not, *in itself*, constitute proof of repentance such as is acceptable in the external forum, because it may be devoid of real sorrow and end in refusal of absolution, and the confessor cannot be asked to reveal the verdict either way. But the law does not require proof of repentance; signs suffice, and the summoning of a confessor is a commonly accepted sign to which the confessor can testify. Even, therefore, if the woman in question was merely known "to have had the priest" at her deathbed, this would normally suffice to prove that she had escaped the penalty of deprivation. If, in addition, as the question implies, she received Extreme Unction and/or Viaticum, her right to ecclesiastical burial is certain.

Scandal must be avoided, and therefore care must be taken to ensure that those who were aware of her sin are made aware of her "signs of repentance". For this, however, as a French theologian observes,<sup>2</sup> it should be sufficient to pass the word to a few of the parish gossips. If, in an exceptional case, grave scandal cannot altogether be removed, the burial ceremonies can be reduced to the minimum. If the signs of repentance cannot themselves be sufficiently established, the local Ordinary should be consulted and his decision made known.

L. L. McR.

<sup>1</sup> Canon 1215 requires the ceremony to be performed in full, "*nisi gravis causa obstet*".

<sup>2</sup> *L'Ami du Clerge*, 30 September 1954, p. 588.

## ROMAN DOCUMENT

THE RESTORED LITURGICAL ORDER OF  
HOLY WEEK

## SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM

## DECRETUM GENERALE

LITURGICUS HEBDOMADAE SANCTAE ORDO INSTAURATUR (*A.A.S.*, 1955,  
XLVII, p. 838).

Maxima redemptionis nostrae mysteria, passionis nempe, mortis et resurrectionis Domini nostri Iesu Christi, ab apostolica inde aetate singulari prorsus recordatione celebrare quotannis studuit sancta Mater Ecclesia. Summa in primis eorundem mysteriorum momenta peculiari triduo recolebantur, Christi scilicet "crucifixi, sepulti, suscitati";<sup>1</sup> mox institutionis sanctissimae Eucharistiae solemnis memoria addita fuit; ac demum, dominica quae passionem proxime antecedit, liturgica accessit celebratio triumphalis Domini nostri Regis messianici ingressus in sanctam civitatem; peculiaris exinde liturgica hebdomada exorta est, quae, ob excellentiam mysteriorum celebratorum, et sancta appellata et amplissimis piissimisque ritibus ditata fuit.

Hi autem ritus iisdem hebdomadae diebus iisdemque dierum horis initio celebrabatur quibus sacrosancta mysteria contigerunt. Institutio itaque sanctissimae Eucharistiae feria quinta, vespere, recolebatur, solemni Missa in Cena Domini; feria autem sexta peculiaris actio liturgica de passione et morte Domini horis post-meridianis celebrabatur; denique vespere sabbati sancti solemnis inchoabatur vigilia, quae mane sequenti in gaudio resurrectionis finem habebat.

Media autem aetate, tempus agendaе liturgiae his diebus, variis in id concurrentibus causis, ita anticipari coeptum est, ut eadem media aetate ad finem vergente, omnes liturgicae illae solemnitates ad horas usque matutinas antepositae fuerint, profecto non sine detrimento liturgici sensus, nec sine confusione inter evangelicas narrationes et ad eas pertinentes liturgicas repraesentationes. Solemnis praesertim paschalis vigiliae liturgia, a propria nocturna sede

<sup>1</sup> *S. Augustinus*, Ep. 55, 14; Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat. 34, 2, p. 195.

avulsa, nativam perspicuitatem ac verborum et symbolorum sensum amisit. Praeterea sabbati sancti dies, praecoci paschali gaudio invasus, propriam indolem perdidit luctuosam memoriae dominicae sepulturae.

Recentiore porro aetate alia denique accessit rerum mutatio eademque sub aspectu pastorali gravissima. Etenim, feria quinta, sexta et sabbatum sanctae hebdomadae per plura saecula inter dies festivos connumerabantur, eo sane consilio, ut cunctus populus christianus, a servilibus operibus expeditus, sacris horum dierum caerimoniis interesse posset; at saeculo decimo septimo currente ipsi Romani Pontifices, ob condiciones vitae socialis prorsus immutatas, dierum festivorum numerum imminuere adacti sunt. Urbanus itaque VIII, Constitutione apostolica "Universa per orbem", diei 24 Septembris anni 1642, sacrum quoque hebdomadae sanctae triduum, non amplius inter festivos, sed inter feriales dies recensere coactus est.

Exinde vero fidelium ad sacros hos ritus frequentia necessario decrevit, ea praesertim de causa, quod eorum celebratio iam diu ad horas matutinas anteposita fuerat, quando scilicet scholae, opificia et publica cuiusque generis negotia, ubique terrarum, diebus ferialibus peragi solent et peraguntur. Communis reapse et quasi universalis experientia docet, solemnes gravesque has sacri tridui liturgicas actiones a clericis peragi solere, ecclesiarum aulis saepe quasi desertis.

Quod sane valde est dolendum. Etenim sacrosanctae hebdomadae liturgici ritus, non solum singulari dignitate, sed et peculiari sacramentali vi et efficacia pollent ad christianam vitam alendam, nec aequam obtinere possunt compensationem per pia illa devotionum exercitia, quae extraliturgica appellari solent, quaeque sacro triduo horis postmeridianis absolvuntur.

His de causis viri in re liturgica peritissimi, sacerdotes curam animarum gerentes, et in primis ipsi Excellentissimi Antistites, recentioribus annis enixas ad Sanctam Sedem preces detulerunt, postulantes, ut liturgicae sacri tridui actiones, ad horas, ut olim, postmeridianas revocarentur, eo sane consilio, ut omnes fideles facilius iisdem ritibus interesse possint.

Re autem mature perpensa, Summus Pontifex Pius XII, anno iam 1951, sacrae paschalis vigiliae liturgiam instauravit, ad nutum interim Ordinariorum et ad experimentum peragendam.

Cum porro huiusmodi experimentum optimum universe habuerit successum, prout Ordinarii quamplures Sanctae Sedi retulerunt, cumque iisdem Ordinarii petitiones iterare non omiserint, poscentes, ut sicut pro vigilia paschali, ita etiam pro aliis sanctae



hebdomadae diebus similis fieret liturgica instauratio, sacris functionibus ad horas vespertinas restitutis, attento denique quod Missae vespertinae, per Constitutionem apostolicam "Christus Dominus" diei 6 Ianuarii anni 1953 praevisae, frequentiore adstante populo ubicumque celebrantur; his omnibus prae oculis habitis, Ss<sup>us</sup> D. N. Pius Papa XII mandavit ut Commissio instaurandae liturgiae, ab eodem Ss<sup>no</sup> Domino constituta, quaestionem hanc de Ordine hebdomadae sanctae instaurando examinaret et conclusionem proponeret. Qua obtenta, eadem Sanctitas Sua decrevit ut, pro rei gravitate, tota quaestio peculiari examini subiceretur Eminentissimorum Patrum Sacrae Rituum Congregationis.

Eminentissimi autem Patres, in Congregatione extraordinaria diei 19 iulii currentis anni, ad aedes Vaticanas coadunati, re mature perpensa, unanimi suffragio Ordinem hebdomadae sanctae instauratum approbandum et praescribendum censuerunt, si Ss<sup>no</sup> Domino placuerit.

Quibus omnibus Ss<sup>no</sup> Domino Nostro ab infrascripto Cardinali Praefecto per singula relatis, Sanctitas Sua ea, quae iidem Eminentissimi Cardinales deliberaverant, approbare dignata est.

Quapropter, de speciali mandato eiusdem Ss<sup>ni</sup> D. N. Pii divina Providentia Papae XII, Sacra Rituum Congregatio ea quae sequuntur statuit:

### **I—Instauratus Ordo hebdomadae sanctae praescribitur**

1. Qui ritum romanum sequuntur, in posterum servare tenentur Ordinem hebdomadae sanctae instauratum, in editione typica Vaticana descriptum. Qui alios ritus latinos sequuntur, tenentur tantummodo servare tempus celebrationum liturgicarum in novo Ordine statutum.

2. Novus hic Ordo servari debet a die 25 Martii, dominica II Passionis seu in palmis, anni 1956.

3. Per totam hebdomadam sanctam nulla admittitur commemoratio, et in Missa prohibentur quoque collectae, quolibet titulo imperatae.

### **II—De hora competenti qua sacra Liturgia hebdomadae sanctae celebranda est**

#### *De officio divino*

4. Dominica II Passionis seu in palmis, feria II, III et IV hebdomadae sanctae, officium divinum horis consuetis persolvitur.

5. In triduo sacro, id est: feria V in Cena Domini, feria VI in Passione et Morte Domini, et sabbato sancto, si officium peragatur *in choro*, vel *in communi*, haec servantur:

Matutinum et Laudes non anticipantur de sero, sed dicuntur mane, hora competenti. In ecclesiis tamen, ubi feria V in Cena Domini Missa chrismatis mane celebretur, Matutinum et Laudes eiusdem feriae V anticipari possunt de sero.

Horae minores dicuntur hora competenti.

Vesperae feria V et VI omittuntur, cum earum locum teneant functiones liturgicae principales horum dierum. Sabbato sancto vero dicuntur post meridiem, hora consueta.

Completorium feria V et VI dicitur post functiones liturgicas vespertinas; sabbato sancto omittitur.

*In privata recitatione*, his tribus diebus, omnes horae canonicae dici debent, iuxta rubricas.

*De Missa vel actione liturgica principali*

6. Dominica II Passionis sollemnis benedictio et processio ramorum fiunt mane, hora consueta; in choro autem post Tertiam.

7. Feria V in Cena Domini, Missa chrismatis celebratur post Tertiam. Missa autem in Cena Domini celebranda est vespere, hora magis opportuna, non autem ante horam quintam post meridiem, nec post horam octavam.

8. Feria VI in Passione et Morte Domini sollemnis actio liturgica celebratur horis postmeridianis, et quidem circa horam tertiam; si vero ratio pastoralis id suadeat, licet tardiozem seligere horam, non autem ultra horam sextam.

9. Solemnis paschalis vigilia celebranda est hora competenti, ea scilicet, quae permittat Missam solemnem eiusdem vigiliae incipere circa mediam noctem inter sabbatum sanctum et dominicam Resurrectionis.

Ubi tamen, ponderatis fidelium et locorum condicionibus, de iudicio Ordinarii loci, horam celebrandae vigiliae anticipari conveniat, haec non inchoetur ante diei crepusculum, aut certe non ante solis occasum.

**III—De abstinentia et ieiunio quadragesimali ad mediam noctem sabbati sancti protrahendis**

10. Abstinentia et ieiunium tempore quadragesimae praescriptum, quod hucusque, iuxta can. 1252 §4, sabbato sancto cessabat

post meridiem, in posterum cessabit media nocte eiusdem sabbati sancti.

Contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Die 16 Novembris anni 1955.

C. Card. CICOGNANI, *Praefectus*

† A. CARINICI, Archiep. Seleuc., *a secretis*

## INSTRUCTIO

### DE ORDINE HEBDOMADAE SANCTAE INSTAURATO RITE PERAGENDO

Cum propositum instaurati Ordinis hebdomadae sanctae eo spectet, ut veneranda liturgia horum dierum, horis propriis simulque opportunis restituta, a fidelibus facilius, devotius ac fructuosius frequentari possit, permagni interest, ut idem salutare propositum ad optatum exitum deducatur.

Propterea Sacrae huic Rituum Congregationi opportunum visum est, generali decreto de instaurato Ordine hebdomadae sanctae *Instructionem* addere, qua et transitus ad novum ordinem facilius reddatur, et fideles ad uberiores fructus ex viva participatione sacrarum caerimoniarum percipiendos securius ducantur.

Omnibus itaque quorum interest huius *Instructionis* cognitio et observantia iniungitur.

### I—De praeparatione pastoralis et rituali

1. Locorum Ordinarii sedulo provideant, ut sacerdotes, praesertim qui curam animarum gerunt, bene sint edocti, non solum de rituali celebratione instaurati Ordinis hebdomadae sanctae, verum etiam de eius liturgico sensu ac pastoralis proposito.

Curent praeterea ut etiam fideles, sacro quadragesimali tempore, aptius instruuntur ad instauratum hebdomadae sanctae Ordinem rite intelligendum, ita ut eiusdem celebrationis mente et animo participes fiant.

2. Praecipua autem capita instructionis populo christiano tradendae haec sunt:

#### (a) *Pro dominica II Passionis, quae "in palmis" vocatur*

Invitentur fideles ut frequentiores ad solemnem processionem palmarum conveniant, Christo Regi publicum testimonium amoris et gratitudinis reddituri.

Moneantur porro fideles ut tempestive, currente sancta hebdomada, ad sacramentum paenitentiae accedant; quae quidem monitio illic praesertim urgenda est, ubi consuetudo invaluit ut fideles vespere sabbati sancti et mane dominicae Resurrectionis quasi catervatim ad sacrum tribunal conveniant. Studeant igitur animarum curatores ut per totam sanctam hebdomadam, praesertim vero sacro triduo, fidelibus facilis occasio praebeatur ad sacramentum paenitentiae accedendi.

(b) *Pro feria V in Cena Domini*

Erudiantur fideles de amore quo Christus Dominus, "pridie quam pateretur", sacrosanctam instituit Eucharistiam, sacrificium et sacramentum, Passionis suae memoriale perpetuum, sacerdotum ministerio perenniter celebrandum.

Invitentur quoque fideles, ut post Missam in Cena Domini, debitam augustissimo Sacramento adorationem reddant.

Ubi demum pedum lotio, ad mandatum Domini de amore fraterno demonstrandum, secundum Ordinis instaurati rubricas in ecclesia peragitur, edoceantur fideles de profunda huius sacri ritus significatione, ac de opportunitate ut ipsi hoc die christianae caritatis operibus abundant.

(c) *Pro feria VI in Passione et Morte Domini*

Disponantur fideles ad rectam intelligentiam singularis actionis liturgicae huius diei, in qua, post Lectiones sacras et preces, Passio Domini nostri solemniter decantatur; orationes pro totius Ecclesiae et generis humani necessitatibus offeruntur; deinde a familia christiana, clero et populo, sancta Crux, nostrae redemptionis trophaeum, devotissime adoratur; postremo, iuxta instaurati Ordinis rubricas et sicut mos fuit per multa saecula, omnes qui id cupiunt et rite parati sunt, ad sacram quoque communionem accedere possunt, ea potissimum mente, ut corpus Domini, pro omnibus hoc die traditum, devote sumentes, uberiores redemptionis fructus percipiant.

Insistent porro sacerdotes ut fideles hoc sacratissimo die piam servant mentis recollectionem, nec legem obliviscantur abstinentiae et ieiunii.

(d) *Pro sabbato sancto et vigilia paschali*

Oportet in primis, ut fideles de peculiari natura liturgica sabbati sancti diligenter edoceantur. Est autem dies summi luctus, quo Ecclesia ad sepulcrum Domini immoratur, passionem eius et

mortem meditando; a sacrificio Missae, sacra mensa denudata, abstinendo; usque dum, post solemnem vigiliam seu nocturnam Resurrectionis expectationem, locus detur gaudiis paschalibus, quorum abundantia in sequentes dies exundat.

Huius vero vigiliae propositum et finis in eo est, ut liturgica actione demonstretur et recolatur, quomodo ex morte Domini nostra promanaverit vita, et gratia. Itaque sub cerei paschali signo ipse Dominus "lux mundi"<sup>1</sup> proponitur, qui peccatorum nostrorum tenebras, gratia suae lucis, profligavit; paschale praeconium profertur, quo splendor sanctae noctis Resurrectionis decantatur; memorantur Dei magnalia in antiquo foedere peracta, mirabilia Novi Testamenti pallentes imagines; aqua baptismalis benedicitur, in qua, "consepulti cum Christo" in mortem peccati, cum eodem Christo resurgimus, ut "in novitate vitae ambulemus";<sup>2</sup> hanc denique gratiam, quam Christus nobis promeruit et in baptismo contulit, renovatis eiusdem baptismatis promissionibus, vita moribusque coram omnibus testificari pollicemur; postremo, implorato triumphantis Ecclesiae interventu, sacra vigilia solemni Resurrectionis Missa terminatur.

3. Nec minus necessaria est praeparatio ritualis sacrarum caerimoniarum hebdomadae sanctae.

Quapropter ea omnia, quae ad piam ac decoram celebrationem liturgicam huius sanctissimae hebdomadae occurrunt, sollicite paranda et ordinanda sunt; sacri praeterea ministri ceterique ministrantes, sive clerici sive laici, potissimum si pueri sint, iis quae ab ipsis paragenda erunt, sedulo instituantur.

## II—Adnotationes ad quasdam rubricas Ordinis hebdomadae sanctae

### (a) *Pro universa hebdomada sancta*

4. Ubi copia habeatur sacrorum ministrorum, sacrae functiones hebdomadae sanctae cum omni splendore sacrorum rituum peragantur. Ubi vero sacri ministri desint, adhibeatur ritus simplex, servatis rubricis peculiaribus, ut suis locis notatur.

5. In Ordine hebdomadae sanctae instaurato, quotiescumque dicitur: "ut in Breviario romano", omnia desumenda sunt ex praedicto libro liturgico, servatis autem normis, per decretum generale S. Rituum Congregationis "De rubricis ad simpliciores formam redigendis", diei 23 Martii anni 1955, statutis.

<sup>1</sup> IOAN. 8, 12.

<sup>2</sup> Rom. 6, 4.

6. Per totam hebdomadam sanctam, id est a dominica II Passionis seu in palmis usque ad Missam vigiliae paschalis inclusive, in Missa (et feria VI in solempni actione liturgica), si solemniter celebratur, scilicet cum ministris sacris, ea omnia, quae diaconus vel subdiaconus aut lector, vi proprii officii cantant vel legunt, a celebrante omittuntur.

(b) *Pro dominica II Passionis seu in palmis*

7. In benedictione et processione adhibeantur rami palmarum seu olivarum, vel aliarum arborum. Hi rami, secundum locorum varios usus, vel ab ipsis fidelibus parantur et in ecclesiam afferuntur; vel, benedictione peracta, fidelibus distribuuntur.

(c) *Pro feria V in Cena Domini*

8. Pro solempni Sacramenti repositione paretur locus aptus in aliquo sacello vel altari ecclesiae, sicut in Missali romano praescribitur, et decenter quoad fieri potest, ornetur velis et luminaribus.

9. Servatis Sacrae Rituum Congregationis decretis de vitandis vel tollendis abusibus in hoc loco parando, plane commendatur severitas quae liturgiae horum dierum convenit.

10. Parochi vel ecclesiarum rectores tempestive moneant fideles de publica adoratione sanctissimae Eucharistiae, inde ab expleta Missa in Cena Domini instituenda, et protrahenda saltem usque ad mediam noctem, quando scilicet liturgicae recordationi institutionis sanctissimae Eucharistiae succedit memoria passionis et mortis Domini.

(d) *Pro vigilia paschali*

11. Nihil impedit quominus signa, in cereo paschali a celebrante stilo incidenda, coloribus vel alio modo antea praeparentur.

12. Convenit, ut candelae, quas clerus et populus gestant, accensae maneant, dum praeconium paschale canitur, et dum renovatio promissionum baptismatic peragitur.

13. Vas aquae benedicendae convenienter ornari decet.

14. Si aderunt baptizandi, praesertim si plures sint, permittitur caerimonias Ritualis romani, quae ipsam baptismi collationem praecedunt, id est, in baptismo infantum usque ad verba "Credis in Deum",<sup>1</sup> et in baptismo adultorum usque ad verba "Quis vocaris?"<sup>2</sup> eodem mane, tempore opportuno, praemittere.

<sup>1</sup> *Rituale romanum*, tit. II, cap. II, n. 17.

<sup>2</sup> *Rituale romanum*, tit. II, cap. IV, n. 38.

15. Si contingat in hac solemnī vigilia sacras quoque Ordinationes conferri, Pontifex ultimam admonitionem (cum impositione sic dicti "pensi"), quae iuxta Pontificale romanum post benedictionem pontificalem et ante ultimum Evangelium locum habet, hac nocte eidem benedictioni pontificali praemittat.

16. In vigilia Pentecostes, omissis Lectionibus seu Prophetiis, et aquae baptismalis benedictione ac litanis, Missa etiam conventualis, vel solemnī aut cantata, incipitur more solito, facta ad gradus altaris confessione, ab introitu "Cum sanctificātus fūero" ut in Missali romano ibidem pro Missis privatis ponitur.

### III—De Missa, sacra communione et ieiunio eucharistico in triduo sacro

17. Feria V in Cena Domini, antiquissima romanae Ecclesiae servanda est traditio, qua, privatarum Missarum celebratione interdicta, omnes sacerdotes omnesque clerici, sacris in Cena Domini intersint, quos expedit ad sacram mensam accedere.<sup>1</sup>

Ubi vero ratio pastoralis id postulet, loci Ordinarius unam alteramve Missam lectam in singulis ecclesiis vel oratoriis publicis permittere poterit; in oratoriis autem semipublicis unam tantum Missam lectam; ea quidem de causa, ut omnes fideles hoc sacro die Missae sacrificio interesse et corpus Christi sumere possint. Hae autem Missae inter easdem diei horas permittuntur, quae pro Missa solemnī in Cena Domini assignatae sunt.<sup>2</sup>

18. Eadem feria V in Cena Domini, sacra communio fidelibus distribui potest tantummodo inter Missas vespertinas, vel continuo ac statim ab iis expletis; item sabbato sancto dari potest tantummodo inter Missarum solemnīa, vel continuo ac statim ab iis expletis; exceptis infirmis in periculo mortis constitutis.

19. Feria VI in Passione et Morte Domini, sacra communio distribui potest unice inter solemnem actionem liturgicam postmeridianam, exceptis item infirmis in periculo mortis constitutis.

20. Sacerdotes, qui Missam solemnem vigiliae paschatis hora propria celebrant, id est post mediam noctem quae interc dit inter sabbatum et dominicam, possunt ipso dominico die Resurrectionis Missam festivam celebrare, atque etiam, si indultum habeatur, bis aut ter.

21. Locorum Ordinarii, qui feria V in Cena Domini, Missam chrismatis mane celebraverint, possunt vespere Missam quoque

<sup>1</sup> Cfr. can. 862.

<sup>2</sup> *Decretum*, II, 7.



solemnem in Cena Domini litare; verum sabbato sancto, si vigiliam solemnem paschalem celebrare voluerint, possunt, sed non tenentur, Missam solemnem ipso die dominicae Resurrectionis litare.

22. Quoad ieiunium eucharisticum servantur normae in Constitutione apostolica "Christus Dominus" et in adnexa "Instructione" Supremae S. Congregationis S. Officii, diei 6 Ianuarii anni 1953, traditae.

#### IV—De quibusdam difficultatibus componendis

23. Cum pro diversitate locorum et gentium plures numerentur populares consuetudines, hebdomadae sanctae celebrationi connexae, studeant locorum Ordinarii et sacerdotes curam animarum gerentes, ut consuetudines huiusmodi, quae solidam pietatem fovere videantur, cum instaurato Ordine hebdomadae sanctae prudenter componantur. Edoceantur porro fideles de summo valore sacrae Liturgiae, quae semper, et his praesertim diebus, ceteras devotionis species et consuetudines, quamvis optimas, natura sua longe praecellit.

24. Ubi mos hucusque vigit domos benedicendi ipso sabbati sancti die, locorum Ordinarii congruas edant dispositiones, ut haec benedictio opportuniore tempore, ante vel post Paschatis festum, a parochis, vel ab aliis sacerdotibus animarum curam gerentibus ab ipsis delegatis, peragatur, qui, hanc nacti occasionem, fideles sibi commissos paterne invisent, ac de eorum statu spirituali certiores se reddant.<sup>1</sup>

25. Campanarum pulsatio, in Missa vigiliae paschalis, ad initium hymni Gloria in excelsis praescripta, hoc modo fiat.

(a) In locis, in quibus una tantum habetur ecclesia, campanae pulsantur hora, qua dicti hymni incipit cantus.

(b) In locis autem, ubi plures ecclesiae exstant, sive in omnibus eodem tempore sacrae caerimoniae peragantur, sive tempore diverso, campanae omnium ecclesiarum eiusdem loci pulsantur una cum campanis ecclesiae cathedralis, vel matricis aut principalis. In dubio quaenam ecclesia in loco sit matrix aut principalis, adeatur Ordinarius loci.

Die 16 Novembris anni 1955.

C. Card. CICOGNANI, *Praefectus*

L. ✠ S.

† A. CARINCI, Archiep. Seleuc., *a secretis*

<sup>1</sup> Can. 462, n. 6.

The above is the only authentic text of the Decree and accompanying Instruction. We are indebted to the Very Rev. Mgr. C. P. Cronin, Secretary to the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, for the following list of passages in which it differs from the text printed in the *Osservatore Romano* of 27 November 1955:

DECREE "MAXIMA REDEMPTIONIS"

II, 5. *Text of Osservatore:*

In ecclesiis tamen *cathedralibus*, cum feria V in Cena Domini Missa chrismatis mane celebretur, Matutinum et Laudes eiusdem feriae V anticipari possunt de sero.

*Text of Acta:*

In ecclesiis tamen, ubi feria V in Cena Domini Missa chrismatis mane celebretur, Matutinum et Laudes eiusdem feriae V anticipari possunt de sero.

INSTRUCTION OF S. CONGREGATION OF RITES

I, 1. *Text of Osservatore:*

. . . Curent praeterea ut etiam fideles, sacro quadragesimali tempore, aptius instruuntur ad instauratum hebdomadae sanctae Ordinem rite intelligendum, *ita ut in eiusdem celebratione mente ac spiritu devotam sumant partem.*

*Text of Acta*

. . . Curent praeterea . . . *ita ut eiusdem celebrationis mente et animo participes fiant.*

I, 2, b. *Text of Osservatore.*

Erudiantur fideles de amore quo Christus Dominus "pridie quam pateretur", sacrosanctum instituit Eucharistiam, sacrificium et sacramentum, Passionis suae memoriale perpetuum, *per manus sacerdotum perenniter celebrandum.*

*Text of Acta:*

Erudiantur fideles . . . perpetuum, *sacerdotum ministerio perenniter celebrandum.*

II, d, 14. *Text of Osservatore:*

Si aderunt baptizandi, praesertim si plures sint, permittitur caerimonias Ritualis Romani, quae ipsam bap-

tismi collationem praecedunt, id est, in baptisate infantum usque ad verba "Credis". . . .

*Text of Acta:*

Si aderunt . . . usque ad verba "Credis in Deum". . . .

III, 17. *Text of Osservatore:*

Feria V in Cena Domini, antiquissima romanae Ecclesiae servanda est traditio, qua, privatarum missarum celebratione interdicta, omnes sacerdotes, omnesque clerici, sacris in Cena Domini intersint, ad sacram mensam accessuri.

*Text of Acta:*

Feria V . . . intersint, quos expedit ad sacram mensam accedere.

III, 18. *Text of Osservatore:*

. . . item sabbato sancto dari potest tantummodo inter missarum solemnias, vel continuo ac statim ab iis expletis; *exceptis infirmis vel in periculo mortis constitutis.*

*Text of Acta:*

. . . item . . . expletis; *exceptis infirmis in periculo mortis constitutis.*

III, 19. *Text of Osservatore:*

Feria VI in Passione et Morte Domini, sacra communio distribui potest unice inter solemnem actionem liturgicam postmeridianam, *exceptis item infirmis vel in periculo mortis constitutis.*

*Text of Acta:*

Feria VI . . . postmeridianam, *exceptis item infirmis in periculo mortis constitutis.*

III, 22. *Text of Osservatore:*

Quoad ieiunium eucharisticum servantur normae in Constitutione apostolica "Christus Dominus" diei 6 ianuarii anni 1953 traditae.

*Text of Acta:*

Quoad ieiunium eucharisticum servantur normae in Constitutione apostolica "Christus Dominus" et in adnexa "Instructione" Supremae S. Congregationis S. Officii, diei 6 Ianuarii anni 1953, traditae.

## BOOK REVIEWS

*Preparing for Easter.* By Clifford Howell, S.J. Pp. 116. (Burns & Oates. 1955. 6s.)

WHEN the decree *Dominicae Resurrectionis Vigiliam*, restoring the solemn Easter Vigil, was issued by the Congregation of Sacred Rites (S.R.C.) on 2 February 1951, it was accompanied by a series of "Directions". The very first of these states that "the faithful should, during Lent, be prepared by suitable instructions for the fruitful celebration of the Easter Vigil, and more especially for the solemn renewal of their baptismal vows". The new decree *Maxima Redemptionis Nostrae Mysteria* (of 16 November 1955), by which the liturgical Order of Holy Week is restored, is accompanied by an Instruction in which S.R.C. insists on the absolute necessity of instructing the people about the new rite, "that the faithful may reap more abundant fruit by a living participation in the sacred ceremonies", and sets forth the points on which the people must be informed for the four great days of the most important week of the liturgical year.

For the majority of the people the Liturgy is a corpse, and it must be brought to life and their part in it made a real, living, active participation that they may benefit by its sacramental power. This can be done only by a long and patient instruction on the real meaning of the Sacred Liturgy and the important part it plays in the life of the Church, and on the deep significance of its beautiful ceremonial, especially that of Holy Week, now happily restored to its pristine meaningful simplicity and strength.

To help the faithful to grasp the meaning of the Holy Week sacred rites and fully benefit by participation in them, and more especially to aid priests whose duty it is to instruct the faithful, Father Howell prepared this excellent little book. In it he outlines a series of eight preparatory instructions intended to be given on the Sundays from Septuagesima to Passion Sunday, and then eight further instructions dealing with the spiritual meaning of the ceremonies of the four chief days of Holy Week. To round off these helpful chapters the author has added some specimen commentaries for use at appropriate moments during the actual services of Good Friday and Holy Saturday, and some practical suggestions for the due performance of the sacred ceremonies.

Father Howell has, in a marked degree, that very valuable quality of the really good teacher, the power of popular exposition,

the faculty of explaining difficult things with great clarity and simplicity, and in a telling manner. Although this book was first written to deal chiefly with the new Easter Vigil rite, it has lost none of its value by the recent publication of the new complete Order for Holy Week. Indeed the writer has shown a remarkably intelligent anticipation of some of the changes that were desirable, and that the Holy See has now put into effect. His book is doubly valuable at the present moment.

J. B. O'C.

*Life Is Worth Living.* By Fulton J. Sheen. Pp. 251. (Peter Davies, London. 12s. 6d.)

*The Eternal Galilean.* By Fulton J. Sheen. Pp. 199. (Browne & Nolan, Dublin. 15s.)

TWENTY-SIX TV talks, in which Bishop Sheen assured millions of Americans that—in the title of these talks, now published—*Life Is Worth Living*, bring hope and encouragement at a time when such qualities are sorely needed. The spectre of Communism (Bishop Sheen has much to say about it) still casts over men its fearful shadow, but the ghost can be laid if people's lives are straightened out according to the Christian ethic.

Whilst discussing the problems of the day, the author does so with many a wise sentence. "It is not so much the trials and sufferings in certain marriages that make marriage unbearable; it is how people *react* to the sufferings." "Obscenity is the turning of mystery into a jest." "There is a difference between blarney and boloney: blarney is the varnished truth, boloney is the unvarnished lie." In view of his direct and original treatment of our social questions, it is not surprising that these TV talks brought to Bishop Sheen nine thousand letters a week, many more than most people receive in a lifetime. Not only does the Bishop oblige men to heed what he says; he also compels their assent to his solution of their problems—on the one essential condition that they follow the Son of God Who came upon earth to guide men in the way of truth and happiness.

*The Eternal Galilean* comprises many of Bishop Sheen's finest sermons, arranged chronologically to give an ordered and comprehensive view of the life of our Lord. In whatsoever way he regards the Man of Galilee, the preacher brings Him forward as the Man-God Eternal; and inevitably, in leading listeners and readers to Christ, our guide prepares for the interview—so to say—by discussing the crucial questions that torture the minds of present-day enquirers. To illustrate Bishop Sheen's attitude of mind, here is an

extract. "Would that our civilization would cease turning over the dust of the primeval jungles in search of the link that ties us to the beast, and begin to kneel before the uplifted cross on the rocks of Calvary in search of the link that binds us to God."

There is fine thought behind all the author's statements. He preaches the unchanging truths of Christianity, the same that have been preached for the past two thousand years; but he presents them with a new turn of phrase and in the light of modern ideas, so that they frequently come to one's notice with the freshness of new discoveries. This book should bring tranquillity to many disturbed by doubt, enabling them to see their way through life, along a road that leads with unerring certainty to the one logical and reasonable end for which mankind was brought into existence.

*The Fisherman's Ring.* By Teri Martini. Pp. ix + 117. (St Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey. \$2.00.)

*Saint Pie X.* By Pierre Fernessole. Pp. 62. (P. Lethielleux, Rue Cassette 10, Paris. (No price indicated.)

MANY popes have worn the Fisherman's Ring, but not one of them was more simple and humble than Giuseppe Sarto, the peasant boy who became the Vicar of Christ and is now known to the world as Saint Pius X. His personal history makes an entertaining story. Difficulties—and there were many—are surmounted, the hoped-for happens, prayers are answered, dreams come true. If it were not for the indisputable facts of the historical record we might be in a world of make-believe as we review the Saint's career. Its glorious climax would appear to have been reached as he was borne along the Grand Canal to be Patriarch of Venice; but there were greater things yet to come. The wonderful story did not close until the boy who had worked in the fields had been crowned as Pope, and finally had achieved the greatest of all possible human triumphs in his canonization.

Miss Martini knows well how to write for children, as June Roberts knows the kind of illustrations they like. The combined work of these two ladies, beautifully printed and strongly bound, makes an unrivalled book-gift for a child. Grown-ups who read this work will rejoice at one element not always found in the tale of a poor boy's vocation: everyone was helpful, and especially the parish priest. Although Giuseppe lacked much that might have made his career less arduous, he started with one very great advantage in the love and care of his remarkable mother Margherita. She conforms per-

fectly to the best type of the valiant woman: true in all things, dependable unto death.

Two years ago Professor Fernessole published a double-volume work on the life and achievements of Pope Pius X. As a completion to it, rather than as a supplement, the author has now written a booklet describing the ceremony of the Saint's canonization, with an account of several miracles, including those accepted for the Process; four excellent photographs, one of them showing the two *miraculés*, Francesco Belsani a Neopolitan barrister, and Sister Maria Aloisia a Sister of Charity from Palermo. This small work contains some appendices and reference notes of much value in rounding off the general history of the saintly Pontiff.

*In the Image of Christ.* By John L. Murphy. Pp. xii + 169. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. \$3.00.)

HAVING already written much in explanation of the Mystical Body, Father Murphy now gives the practical application of this doctrine to the everyday lives of Catholics, however different be their professions or their positions in society. Priests, religious, nurses, teachers, workers of every kind: each in his own sphere should be extending the Kingdom of God upon earth, and this by an apostolic activity in his membership of the Mystical Body of Christ.

The need for a Christian apostolate everywhere is sufficiently obvious. One modern Catholic writer says of the French nation: "The proletariat is a pagan people with Christian superstitions. These superstitions are called Baptism, First Communion, Marriage, Last Rites." Here is a condition of things due to a deficiency in doctrinal instruction and to the absence of truly Catholic example in day-to-day living; due also, perhaps, to the contentment of pious Catholics with their own private religious lives without any active interest in the lives of their fellow-countrymen. The Church cannot be isolationist; nor may it be content to recruit new members by attracting unbelievers. It must mix with the modern pagan, using a power that goes out from the heart alone, to win him to Christ—to Christ living in His Church, living in us.

A careful reading of this book should dissipate many common ideas as to what is a genuine Christian life. We may hope that among these ideas is the rather foolish notion that to be a good follower of our Lord one must live in a monastery. Father Murphy makes it very clear indeed that to follow Christ means to go among men and save them as they are, in their own condition and environment; not to entice them into a new atmosphere erroneously called Catholicity.



*Andrew of Galilee.* By I. G. Capaldi. Pp. ix + 276. (Longmans Green. 10s. 6d.)

*Everyman's Saint.* By Marion A. Harbig, O.F.M. Pp. xi + 195. (St Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey. \$2.00.)

KNOWLEDGE of St Andrew is not generally extensive, it being limited for many people to four or five such facts as: he was the first-called of the Apostles, was brother to Simon Peter, died on his own particular cross, is the Patron of Scotland. Wishing to make him a more familiar figure, Father Capaldi—with a guarded use of his imagination—makes St Andrew the hero of a tale beginning with his birth in Bethsaida, where it so happens that several of the other Apostles were born about the same time. Andrew was one of the “several thirsty fisherman”, as the author calls them, who brought things to a head at the wedding feast of Cana, whence he had followed Jesus. All the Saint's joys and sorrows were the result of his devotion to his Master, from Whom he could hardly avert his eyes since first they beheld Him.

In depicting this Galilean Apostle Father Capaldi does so with Gospel scenes for his background, his subject standing out as a boldly drawn and colourful figure in a picture crowded with interesting detail. The author's descriptions—for instance, of the Temple—are most instructive, and his narration of such events as the curing of the man born blind and the raising of Lazarus brings to his readers the very real wonder surrounding Christ's miracles. To be made familiar with the places so well known to St Andrew, and to see in imagination the incidents in which he played his part, is to have an appreciation of his importance. The author paints for his readers an arresting portrait which very readily comes to life.

Nothing more clearly illustrates St Antony's impact upon the Christian world than the fact that he was raised to the altars of the Church in less than a year after his death: no other Confessor in the calendar was so quickly canonized. It was countless extraordinary miracles that brought this about; but, as the author reminds us, although St Antony's fame rests so largely upon is being the Wonder-worker of all the saints, devotion to him means much more than asking favours.

He is an eminent theologian, a Doctor of the Church whose soundness of doctrine is well proved by his vigorous defence, in the thirteenth century, of Our Lady's Assumption. His universal popularity is beyond adequate description; witness the almost scandalous struggle for possession of his body when he died. But even his Portuguese countrymen must long ago have been reconciled to Padua as the Saint's rightful resting-place. Those of us who have

been  
its b  
ther  
after

Chri

COM  
anc  
plo  
of C  
stor  
in a  
of g  
cern  
Fair  
are  
far-  
wid  
kno  
enc  
Col  
amp  
lion  
and  
disp

Ros  
as s  
hea  
whi  
tial  
unc  
in  
ma  
wh

is t  
ma  
tial  
ma  
for  
enj

been there and have seen the living faith of its people—particularly its boys and men—inspired by the presence of the mortal remains of their patron, can testify to the extraordinary power he still exercises after seven centuries.

*Christians Courageous.* By Aloysius Roche. Pp. viii + 143. (Burns Oates. 13s. 6d.)

COMPARED with the countless heroes of Christendom, those of the ancient pagan world are of a negligible number, nor are their exploits so worthy of record and remembrance as are those of the saints of God. In choosing his handful of dauntless men and women, whose stories he relates for senior boys and girls, Father Roche finds them in a wide variety of country and century, to suit the differing tastes of growing children. He supposes that his young readers like to concern themselves with their own patrons (those who brought the Faith to English-speaking lands or furthered it there) and that they are interested also in brave Christian men, women and children of far-away countries. When he speaks of Greece and Rome he ranges widely enough to include in his tales of antiquity much classical knowledge made easy of acquirement by his readers because of his enchanting style of writing. As an example, his description of the Colosseum cannot fail to hold a child's attention. In this enormous amphitheatre, during the reign of Pompey, no fewer than six hundred lions were killed in one day for the entertainment of the populace; and under Trajan ten thousand gladiators were slain in a special display lasting one-hundred-and-twenty days.

A devout Catholic teacher says that whenever a preacher has the Rosary for his subject, she is prepared to put her fingers in her ears as soon as he mentions Lepanto—as he invariably does; she has heard about it so often. Even she would be thrilled at the way in which the story is told in this book. Don John of Austria (no Christian more courageous than he) with his crushing defeat of the Turks under Selim the Sot—a name that goes for much—saved the Church in his own right glorious day. His exploits and adventures are matched by the achievements of the other great heroes and heroines whose names shine through these pages.

If our Faith is to know what God has said and to believe it, this is the kind of book to bring the knowledge to youthful minds in a manner that defies non-absorption. It engenders a pride in the Christian past and an enthusiasm in the Catholic present, and therefore makes ideal reading-matter for senior children. Not that the book is for them only; their elders also will find it a means of instruction and enjoyment.

*St Brigid of Ireland.* By Alice Curtayne. Pp. 115. (Brown & Nolan, Dublin. 10s. 6d.)

*Matt Talbot.* By Dom F. H. Golland Trindade. Translated from the Portuguese by Conall O'Leary, O.F.M. Pp. x + 126. (St Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey, U.S.A. \$1.50.)

STANDARDIZATION is a characteristic notably absent from the lives of the saints. One expects similarities and resemblances; and family likenesses are to be looked for from those following a Benedict, a Francis or a Dominic. None the less an unfailing feature of hagiography, one ensuring pleasure as well as profit, is the individual difference between any one saint and all the others. St Brigid and Matt Talbot (he is of the saints' company, although not yet beatified) are utterly Irish but also utterly unlike.

St Brigid is revealed in the first shaft of light that falls upon the pages of Ireland's history. She was born a chieftain's daughter near Dundalk about the year 450, and from her earliest years was recognized as a favoured child of grace. She was sought in marriage, but with kindness rejected her suitor, becoming what her ancient countrymen called "a virgin of Christ", doing works of charity to all around her and thus laying the foundation of her ultimate high sanctity. With seven companions, who formed with Brigid a lifelong company, she began the story of Irish religious life. It continued to grow and expand until now its adherents form the main column of advance in all English-speaking countries.

This saint's miraculous powers were manifested from her youth. Being a Celt she was very much at home in the animal kingdom, which she loved and understood and wherein she exercised an uncommon power. Hearing that a poor woodman had accidentally killed the King of Leinster's pet fox, and was under sentence of death, Brigid set out to intercede for him. On the way she called a fox into her chariot, and on arrival at the king's castle she was able with a word to put the little animal through some pretty tricks, and thus placate the angry overlord. Boars, wolves, for all their wildness, became almost human under the influence, so that her life resembles, as the author truly says, a spray of Irish Fioretti.

Matt Talbot was the type of penitent that only the Church can produce. From being a shameless drunkard he became—thanks chiefly to the prayers of his valiant mother—a devout servant of God, for forty years living a blameless life of practical piety. The proofs of his penance were found upon his body at death. His was a lonely end. When he died friendless and unknown in a Dublin street the authorities had no easy task over his identification; but within a year his name was on the lips of a hundred thousand people

who proclaimed him a saint. There appears no doubt of his holiness, although first-class miracles are still needed for his "cause" which becomes more likely of completion as Matt's reputation for genuine sanctity increases. An old religious Brother, who had entered a monastery when his service as a Dublin policeman was ended, thought little enough of Matt Talbot whom—so he assured the writer—he had more than once "moved on"; but even this severe critic, who had seen Matt at his worst, came to revere him as his true penitence was proved beyond question.

That he was a confirmed drunkard for twenty years (he was drinking heavily while still in his teens) witnesses to the strength of will Matt Talbot displayed when at length he took the pledge. His devoted Catholic mother was his one great human support: divine help came in the grace of God through Holy Mass and the Sacraments. Spiritual reading from his favourite authors, St Alphonsus and Father Faber, meant as much to this recluse as does meditation to an enclosed religious. Having made for himself a rule of life, he followed it unremittingly for forty years. The notes he had written (they were discovered after his death) are proof of Matt's balanced sanity in spiritual matters; and his practice of charity, the one way to perfection, was the wholesome fruit of his ardent and active religion. We may hope that the day is not far off when he will be universally acclaimed as the patron saint of the modern working-man.

*Within the Walls.* By Sister M. Laurence, O.P. Pp. viii + 85. (Blackfriars, London. 2s. 6d.)

... and *Spare Me Not in the Making.* By Sister M. C. Frederic. Pp. 93. (Clonmore & Reynolds, Dublin: Burns Oates. 8s. 6d.)

INSTRUCTIVE books on the religious life are not easy to come by. When found they are frequently dry and uninspiring, being usually written by theologians intent upon giving doctrine sufficiently sound to withstand criticism from their most intellectual readers. Entirely different are these two little works, which are for growing-up girls who are curious about the convent life to which they feel vaguely drawn. The authors are religious writing from inside, each of them having spent many years as an observant and happy nun.

Sister M. Laurence conducts a correspondence course with a girl named Marjorie who asks innumerable questions, precisely the questions one would expect from an enthusiastic Catholic. Recalling one or other testy form-mistress, Marjorie asks about Superiors; and when told the truth concerning them says: "So Superiors aren't all kind then!" "They are not," writes Sister, who then points out

(with St Ignatius at her elbow) that they are not less to be obeyed on that account. Put off by the "gross caricatures" spoken of by Pius XI, Marjorie wonders whether St Thérèse of Lisieux was as "sloppy and sentimental" as she has sometimes been represented. Back comes the answer in definite terms, with a story about a Cardinal who was talking to Pius XI, somewhat on the lines of Marjorie's letter. The Pope's remark needs no expanding: "You think her Little Way is an easy way: just try it!" The end of this book is surprising. The author does not make Marjorie a nun, but sensibly marries her off with an attractive S.V.P. Brother of the local Conference.

... and *Spare Me Not in the Making* is not another interchange of letters, but a genuine diary written day by day during Sister M. Frederic's noviciate. There was no thought of publication when the notes and comments were being made; moreover pressure was brought to bear in order to make possible their appearance in book form. A careful reading of these pages from a novice's diary give a true-to-life picture of what goes on in convents during the time preceding Profession, a most exciting time in the particular convent described, even though it be the time of spiritual formation. Excitement is perhaps the dominant note of this diary. Community life is unalterably regular, governed by an inexorable bell; but it is never dull, which accounts for the fact that, as the author says, "thousands of prospective teachers, office workers, musicians, nurses, librarians and others" are urged to make their careers into vocations pursued within convent walls. This book gives as good a description of noviciate life as can anywhere be found, and for that reason will be a boon for any girl feeling her way to the cloister. Novice-mistresses should have copies at hand to pass on to likely postulants.

L. T. H.

*Seeds of the Desert.* The Legacy of Charles de Foucauld. By R. Voillaume. Pp. 368. (Burns Oates. 16s.)

In 1952 I was urged to read a book called *Au Coeur des Masses*, and pored over it for a considerable time. It was a series of letters, papers and talks to novices by the present head of the Little Brothers of Jesus. In this country we know little about this form of spiritual life, following closely in the ideas of their founder. But we know a little more of the founder, for he was Charles de Foucauld, and recently we have had one or two biographies which caused new interest. However, as Archbishop Mathew points out in a Foreword to the present book which is drawn from *Au Coeur des Masses* and "englished", we do not sufficiently understand the significance of this strange

solitary life, and the goal at which Charles de Foucauld was aiming. Our biographies have tended to put too much emphasis upon the explorer, the officer turned hermit, without really touching the heart of this new apostle.

This attempt to integrate his ideas and ideals is therefore of very deep interest. It is a feeling towards a vocation which must be among the hardest in the world . . . the contemplative among men, given to God completely, and yet living still in the noise of the world. A contemplative spirit, which is at the same time prepared to get up and go to the end of the earth, if there seems to be a need there for the presence of the Little Brothers. Charles de Foucauld had the ideal of the poverty of Nazareth, the prayer of Nazareth, the obedience of Nazareth, all these shot through with the love of Nazareth.

Without doubt, anyone can gain a new impulse from reading this presentation of an experiment in Christian living, whether or not he is himself adopting it. It is valuable spiritual reading.

*Giving to God.* By Hubert Van Zeller, O.S.B. Pp. 69. (Burns & Oates. 3s. 6d.)

ANYONE who has used Father Van Zeller's earlier prayers for the young will be delighted to learn from him afresh the method of teaching children to pray. Each chapter is really a visit to the Blessed Sacrament, but each is given under a particular feast or season of the Church's calendar. This affords continuity and an interest in the immediate present, which appears so necessary to captivate the minds and hearts of those at school. Once caught, the effort is to direct the soul to give itself to God in prayer. How often we want only to receive! But it is essential to learn early in life that love is a matter of giving. To harassed parents and teachers this little book will be a godsend.

*The Our Father.* By R. H. J. Steuart, S.J. Pp. 36. (Blackfriars. 2s. (paper).)

GIVEN on several different occasions and much enjoyed, Father Steuart's conferences on the *Our Father* were taken down by different people, and the present version was therefore able to be collated. They were then published as articles in the *Life of the Spirit*, and finally appear in booklet form.

All who knew Father Steuart and his teaching will want to possess these meditations on the greatest of all prayers. Their simple yet witty style goes straight to the point, and in doing so uncovers aspects of prayer so clear and worth while that we have missed them

hitherto. They are optimistic; they encourage the tired, the lazy, the faint-hearted. An admirable approach to our own meditation on Our Lord's prayer.

M. H.

*A Catholic's Guide to Social and Political Action.* By Cyril C. Clump, S.J. Pp. 127. (Catholic Social Guild. 2s.)

THIS new and revised edition is a handy collection of extracts from papal encyclicals and addresses classified under Human Society, The Church and State, Christian Citizenship and International Relations. All that it requires to make it indispensable is a detailed index.

J. F.

*Histoire du Christianisme.* By Dom Charles Poulet, O.S.B. (et plusieurs collaborateurs). Fascicules XXXIII-XXXIV (broché). (Beauchesne et ses Fils. Paris. 1955. No price stated.)

THESE two fascicules, like their immediate predecessors, are solely devoted to the religious history of France. Five rather short chapters about Napoleon are followed by three long ones devoted respectively to the Restoration, 1815-30, "*L'aventure Mennaisienne*", and "*La liberté d'enseignement*", 1830-48; and the riches of the Bibliothèque Nationale are freely available for portraits of everybody of any importance. The standpoint of the writers is strictly and strongly that of churchmen, and as they give in much detail all those things that are left out of the ordinary books the work has a special value, the more so because the Restoration and the July Monarchy are precisely the two periods of modern French history which are least known. There is, however, an astonishing mistake, on p. 793, where Cardinal Pacca is described as "*savoyard comme Joseph de Maistre*". Pacca, whose memoirs and life-story are well known, came from a noble family of Benevento.

J. J. D.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM



y,  
on

p,

m  
ne  
a-  
x.

i-  
).

ly  
rs  
c-  
d  
i-  
of  
d  
ll  
a  
y  
y  
e,  
e  
ll